THE

BOOK OF JOB.

A RHYTHMICAL VERSION WITH INTRODUCTION AND ANNOTATIONS

BY

PROF. TAYLER LEWIS, LL. D.

UNION COLLEGE, SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

A COMMENTARY

BY

OTTO ZÖCKLER, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT GREIFSWALD.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN WITH ADDITIONS

BY

PROF. L. J. EVANS, D.D.

LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CINCINNATI, OHIO

TOGETHER WITH

A GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE POETICAL BOOKS

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF.

NEW YORK:

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

743–745 BROADWAY.

GRANT & FAIRES,
PHILADELPHIA.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

TO THE CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND HOMILETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE BIBLE.

GENERAL EDITORS:

Rev. JOHANN PETER LANGE, D.D.,
Consistorial Counselor and Professor of Theology in the University of Bonn.

Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Sacred Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

I. CONTRIBUTORS TO THE GERMAN EDITION.

Rev. C. A. Auberlen, Ph.D., D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the University of Basle, Switzerland.

Rev. Karl Chr. W. F. Bähr, D.D.,
Ministerial Counselor at Carlsruhe.

Rev. Karl Braune, D.D.,
General Superintendent at Altenburg, Saxony.

Rev. Paulus Cassel, Ph.D.,
Professor in Berlin.

Rev. Chr. Fr. David Erdmann, D.D.,
Gen. Superintendent of Silesia, and Prof. Honorarius of Theology in the University of Breslau.

Rev. F. R. Fay,
Pastor in Crefeld, Prussia.

Rev. G. F. C. Fronmüller, Ph.D.,
Pastor at Kemnath, Würtemberg.

Rev. Karl Gerok, D.D.,
Prelate and Chief Chaplain of the Court, Stuttgart.

Rev. Paul Kleinert, Ph.D., B.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in the University of Berlin.

Rev. Christ. Fr. Kling, D.D.,
Dean of Marbach on the Neckar, Würtemberg.

Rev. Gotthard Victor Lechler, D.D.,
Professor of Theology, and Superintendent at Leipzig.

Rev. Carl Bernhard Moll, D.D.,
General Superintendent in Königsberg.

Rev. C. W. Edward Naegelsbach, Ph.D.,
Dean at Bayreuth, Bavaria.

Rev. J. J. Van Oosterzee, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the University of Utrecht.

Rev. C. J. Riggenbach, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the University of Basle.

Rev. Otto Schmoller, Ph.D., B.D.,
Urach, Würtemberg.

Rev. Fr. Julius Schroeder, D.D.,
Pastor at Elberfeld, Prussia.

Rev. Fr. W. Schultz, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in Breslau.

Rev. Otto Zoeckler, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the University at Greifswald.

II. CONTRIBUTORS TO THE ANGLO-AMERICAN EDITION.

Rev. Charles A. Aiken, Ph.D., D.D.,
Professor of Christian Ethics and Apologetics at Princeton, N. J.

Rev. Samuel Ralph Asbury, M.A.,
Philadelphia.

Rev. George R. Bliss, D.D.,
Professor in Crozer Theological Seminary, Upland, Pa.

Rev. Chas. A. Briggs, D.D.,
Professor of Oriental Languages in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Rev. John A. Broadus, D.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis at Louisville, Ky.

Rev. Talbot W. Chambers, D.D.,
Pastor of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church, New York.

Rev. Thomas J. Conant, D.D.,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rev. E. R. Craven, D.D.,
Newark, N. J.

Rev. Howard Crosby, D.D., LL.D.,
Chancellor of the University of New York.

Rev. Geo. E. Day, D.D.,
Professor in Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS.

Rev. GEO. E. DAY, D. D.,
Professor in Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

Rev. CHAS. ELLIOTT, D.D.,
Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. L. J. EVANS, D.D.,
Professor of New Test. Exegesis in Lane Theol. Seminary, Cincinnati.

Rev. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D.,
Principal and Professor of Divinity in the Free Church College, Glasgow.

Rev. WILLIAM FINDLAY, M.A.,
Pastor of the Free Church, Larkhall, Scotland.

Rev. JOHN FORSYTH, D.D., LL.D.,
Chaplain and Prof. of Ethics and Law in U. S. Mil. Academy, West Point, N. Y.

Rev. FREDERIC GARDINER, D.D.,
Prof. of the Literature of the O. T. in Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Ct.

Rev. ABRAHAM GOSMAN, D.D.,
Lawrenceville, N. J.

Rev. W. HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Oriental Literature in the Theol. Seminary at Princeton, N. J.

Rev. JAMES B. HAMMOND, M.A.,
New York.

Rev. HORATIO B. HACKETT, D.D.,
Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.

Rev. EDWIN HARWOOD, D.D.,
Rector of Trinity Church, New Haven, Conn.

Rev. W. H. HORNBLOWER, D.D.,
Professor of Sacred Rhetoric, etc., in the Theol. Seminary at Allegheny, Pa.

Rt. Rev. JOHN F. HURST, D. D.,
Des Moines, Iowa.

Rev. A. C. KENDRICK, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Greek in the University of Rochester, N. Y.

TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D.,
Professor of Oriental Languages in Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

Rev. JOHN LILLIE, D.D.,
Kingston, N. Y.

Rev. SAMUEL T. LOWRIE, D.D.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. J. FRED. McCURDY, M.A.,
Ass't Professor of the Hebrew Language in the Theol. Sem. at Princeton, N. J.

Rev. CHARLES M. MEAD, Ph.D.,
Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature in the Theol. Sem., Andover, Mass

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS.

Rev. J. Isidor Mombert, D.D.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. Dunlop Moore, D.D.,
New Brighton, Pa.

Miss Eveline Moore,
Newark, N. J.

James G. Murphy, LL.D.,
Professor in the General Assembly's and the Queen's College at Belfast.

Rev. Howard Osgood, D.D.,
Professor of the Interpretation of the Old Test. in the Theol. Sem., Rochester, N. Y.

Rev. Joseph Packard, D.D.,
Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary at Alexandria, Va.

Rev. Daniel W. Poor, D.D.,
Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary at San Francisco, Cal.

Rev. Matthew B. Riddle, D.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Theol. Seminary at Hartford, Conn.

Rev. Chas. F. Schaeffer, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary at Philadelphia.

Rev. William G. T. Shedd, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Rev. Chas. C. Starbuck, M.A.,
Formerly Tutor in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass.

Rev. P. H. Steenstra,
Professor of Biblical Literature at Cambridge, Mass.

Rev. James Strong, D.D.,
Professor of Exegetical Theology in the Drew Theological Seminary, Madison. N. J.

Rev. W. G. Sumner, M.A.,
Professor in Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

Rev. C. H. Toy, D.D.,
Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Harvard University.

Rev. E. A. Washburn, D.D., LL.D.,
Late Rector of Calvary Church, New York.

William Wells, M.A., LL.D.,
Professor of Modern Languages in Union College, New York.

Rev. C. P. Wing, D.D.,
Carlisle, Pa.

Rev. E. D. Yeomans, D.D.,
Orange, N. J.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

TO THE

POETICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By PHILIP SCHAFF.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

TO THE

POETICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

PREFACE BY THE GENERAL EDITOR.

THIS volume embraces three distinct parts, as follows:

1. A General Introduction to the Poetical Books of the Old Testament, by the American Editor. It corresponds to a similar Introduction to the Prophetical Books. In its preparation I have chiefly consulted Lowth, Herder, and Ewald. I might have considerably enlarged it by introducing more specimens, and discussing minutely the difficult questions of Hebrew metre, rhyme, and versification generally, but the great extent of this volume suggested brevity.

2. A new Version of the Book of Job, with brief philological annotations, a preliminary essay, and a series of dissertations on the more difficult passages of the Book, by Prof. TAYLER LEWIS, who has made Job for years the object of special study. He discusses with rare ability and vigor its grand all-pervading Theism, its leading idea and aim, and finds in the humble and unconditional submission to the Divine will the final answer to Satan's question in the Prologue: "Will a man serve God for naught?" The theistic relation of man, made in the image of God, so strongly expressed in Job and Genesis, contains "the power of an endless life" (Heb. vii. 16), though a future state is not dogmatically expressed. The veiled Shemitic idea has more moral power than the Greek or Vedaic conceptions of another life, though the latter seem so much more definite and mythologically clear. The Rhythmical Version aims at fidelity and conciseness, smoothness of measure, and harmony with the Hebrew accentuation and divisions. The Exegetical Notes pay special attention to the broken, ejaculatory or soliloquizing style of Job's speeches, as distinguished from the less impassioned addresses of others; also to the passages on the great works of nature, and those questions in the latter part of Job which—according to Humboldt's dictum—have not as yet been answered by science. (See especially notes on chs. xxviii., xxxvi. to xxxix.) Of the twelve Excursuses on important sections, those on the famous passage ch. xix. 25 (pp. 173 sqq.), on the peculiar character of Job's speeches (175), and on the Angel Intercessor (pp. 208 sqq.) deserve special attention.

3. The Commentary of Prof. ZOECKLER, prepared for the Lange Series (Leipzig, 1872, pp. 321), translated by Dr. L. J. EVANS, Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Literature in Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati. Prof. Evans has given a faithful and idiomatic version of the German work, and has added valuable references,

citations, and critical remarks, mostly in the exegetical part, where the general utility of the commentary seemed to require it. He has also, in the Introduction (pp. 252–262), ventured upon a new and ingenious suggestion in respect to the vexed question of the authorship, which deserves careful consideration. He ascribes it to king Hezekiah, and regards the beautiful ode after his recovery, which Isaiah has preserved (ch. xxxviii. 9-20), as the key-note rather than the echo of Job. To the same age, though not the same author, Ewald, Renan and Merx assign the composition. But the conjectures of a post-Mosaic and post-Solomonic authorship leave it an inexplicable mystery that a pious Israelite enjoying the blessings of the theocracy and the temple service, should, in such a long poem on the highest theme, have purposely ignored the sacred laws and institutions of his Church, and gone back to a simpler and more primitive religion. Ancient literature furnishes no example of such a complete reproduction of a byegone age. For, whoever was the author, he certainly represents a patriarchal state of society and a religion of the order of Melchizedek, the cotemporary of Abraham, the mysterious *ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου, βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης, ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος.*

But I cannot enter into details. The object of the Preface is simply to introduce the reader to the contents of this volume. The remaining parts of the Old Testament division of this Commentary are considerably advanced, even in anticipation of the German work, which has not yet reached Isaiah, the last historical Books, and the post-exilian Prophets.

PHILIP SCHAFF.

NEW YORK, *November* 7, 1874.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

TO THE

POETICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF.

LITERATURE.

I. SPECIAL WORKS.

* **Robert Lowth** (son of William Lowth, who wrote a Commentary on the Prophets, born at Winchester, 1710, Prof. of Poetry, Oxford, since 1741, Bishop of London, since 1777, died 1787): *De Sacra Poesi Hebræorum Prælectiones Academicæ*, 1753; with copious notes by *John David Michaelis* (Prof. in Göttingen, d. 1791), Gött. 1770; another ed. with additional notes by *Rosenmüller*, Leipz. 1815; best Latin edition, with the additions of Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Richter, and Weiss, Oxon. 1828. English translation (*"Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews, with the principal notes of Michaelis"*) by *G. Gregory*, 1787; re-edited with improvements by *Calvin E. Stowe*, Andover, 1829. Comp. also Lowth's preliminary dissertation in his translation of Isaiah (13th ed., Lond., 1842). Lowth's work is the first earnest attempt at a learned and critical discussion of Hebrew Poetry.

* **J. Gottfried Herder** (an almost universal genius and scholar, poet, historian, philosopher and theologian, born 1744 at Mohrungen in East Prussia, died as court chaplain at Weimar, 1803): *Geist der Hebräischen Poesie*, Dessau, 1782; 3d ed. by *Justi*, Leipz., 1825. Full of enthusiasm for the purity and sublimity of Hebrew poetry. English translation by President *James Marsh*, Burlington, Vt., 1833, 2 vols. Comp. also the first twelve *Letters* of Herder *on the Study of Theology*.

L. T. Kosegarten: *Ueber den Dichtergeist der heil. Schriftsteller und Jesu Chr.*, Greifsw., 1794.

A. Gügler: *Die heil. Kunst der Hebräer.* Landshut, 1814.

J. L. Saalschütz: *Von der Form der hebräischen Poesie.* Königsberg, 1825.

M. Nicolas; *Forme de la poesie hébraique*, 1833.

J. G. Wenrich: *Commentatio de poeseos Hebraicæ atque Arabicæ origine, indole mutuoque consensu atque discrimine.* Lips. 1843 (276 pp.).

J. G. Sommer: *Vom Reime in der hebr. Volks-poesie*, in his *Bibl. Abhandlungen*, Bonn, 1846, pp. 85–92.

H. Hupfeld: *Rhythm and Accentuation in Hebrew Poetry*, transl. by Prof. Charles M. Mead in the Andover '*Bibliotheca Sacra*' for 1867.

* **Isaac Taylor** (Independent, a learned layman, d. 1865): *The Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry*, repub., New York, 1862 (with a biographical introduction by Dr. Wm. Adams).

Ernst Meier: *Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der Hebräer*, Leipz., 1856. The same: *Die Form der Hebräischen Poesie*, Tübingen, 1853.

Older essays on Hebrew poetry and music by Lowth (see above), Ebert, Gomarus, Schramm, Fleury, Dannhauer, Pfeiffer, Leyser, Le Clerc, Hare, and others may be found in the XXXIst and XXXIId vols. of **Ugolini's** *Thesaurus.*

II. ARTICLES IN CYCLOPÆDIAS.

G. B. Winer: *Poesie hebräische* in his *Bibl.-Realwörterbuch*, Vol. II., 264–268 (3d ed., 1849).

Ed. Reuss: *Hebräische Poesie*, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, Vol. V., 598–608.

W. A. Wright: *Hebrew Poetry*, in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, (enlarged Am. ed.), Vol. III., pp. 2549–2561.

Diestel: *Dichtkunst der Hebräer*, in Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, I., 607–615.

III. COMMENTARIES AND ISAGOGICAL WORKS.

* **H. Ewald**: *Die Dichter des Alten Bundes*, in 3 Parts, Göttingen, 1854–'67; 2d ed., 1865 sqq., Vol. I., pp. 300. Full of genius and independent research.

E. Meier: *Die poet. Bücher des A. T.*, Stuttgart, 1864.

J. G. Vaihinger: *Die dichterischen Schriften des A. B.* Stuttg., 1856–'58.

R. Weber: *Die poet. Bücher des A. B.* Stuttg., 1853–'60.

Tayler Lewis: *Metrical Version of Koheleth*, with an introduction (in an Appendix to his translation of Lange on *Koheleth*), New York, 1870.

The relevant sections in the Critical Introductions to the Old Testament by De Wette, Haevernick, Keil, Bleek, Horne, *etc.*

§ 1. ORIGIN OF POETRY.

Poetry and music—the highest and most spiritual of the fine arts—are older than the human race; they hail from heaven and from a pre-historic age. The old legend traces the origin of music to the angels, and Raphael paints St. Cecilia, the patroness of church music, as faintly echoing the higher and sweeter chorus from the celestial world. The same applies to poetry, for music presupposes poetry and derives from it its inspiration. Christianity was sung into life by the anthem of the heavenly hosts, who existed before the hexaēmeron or certainly before man, and who are the agents of God in the realm of nature as well as in all great epochs of revelation. The same angels raised their anthems of glory and peace at the completion of the first creation by the hand of the Almighty. Then

> "The morning stars sang together,
> And all the sons of God shouted for joy."*

As poetry and music began in heaven, so they will end in heaven, and constitute a rich fountain of joy to angels and sanctified men.

§ 2. POETRY AND RELIGION.

Poetry and music came from the same God as religion itself, and are intended for the same holy end. They are the handmaids of religion, and the wings of devotion. Nothing can be more preposterous than to assume or establish an antagonism between them. The abuse can never set aside the right use. The best gifts of God are liable to the worst abuse. Some have the false notion that poetry is necessarily fictitious and antagonistic to truth. But poetry is the fittest expression of truth, its Sabbath dress, the silver picture of the golden apple, the ideal embodied in and shining through the real. "Let those," says Lowth,† "who affect to despise the Muses, cease to attempt, for the vices of a few, who may abuse the best of things, to bring into disrepute a most laudable talent. Let them cease to speak of that art as light and trifling in itself, to accuse it as profane or impious; that art which has been conceded to man by the favor of his Creator, and for the most sacred purposes; that art, consecrated by the authority of God Himself, and by His example in His most august ministrations." Dean Stanley says:‡ "There has always been in certain minds a repugnance to poetry, as inconsistent with the gravity of religious feeling. It has been sometimes thought that to speak of a book of the Bible as poetical, is a disparagement of it. It has been in many Churches thought that the more scholastic, dry, and prosaic the forms in which religious doctrine is thrown, the more faithfully is its substance represented. Of all human compositions, the most removed from poetry are the Decrees and Articles of Faith, in which the belief of Christendom has often been enshrined as in a sanctuary.§ To such sentiments the towering greatness of David, the acknowledged preëminence of the Psalter are constant rebukes. David, beyond king, soldier, or prophet, was the sweet singer of Israel. Had Raphael painted a picture of Hebrew as of European Poetry, David would have sate aloft at the summit of the Hebrew Parnassus, the Homer of Jewish song."

§ 3. THE POETRY OF THE BIBLE.

More than one-third of the Old Testament is poetry.

This fact is concealed, and much of the beauty of the Bible lost to many readers by the uniform printing of poetry and prose in our popular Bibles. The current versicular division is purely mechanical, and does not at all correspond to the metrical structure or the laws of Hebrew versification.

The poetry of the Old Testament is contained in the *Poetical Books*, which in the Jewish

---

* Job xxxviii. 7.

† *Lectures on H. P.*, Stowe's ed., p. 28.

‡ *History of the Jewish Church.* II. 164, Am. ed.

§ This disparaging remark about creeds is too sweeping and inapplicable to the oldest and best, the Apostles' and Nicene creeds, which sound like liturgical poems through all ages of Christendom, together with the *Te Deum* and *Gloria in Excelsis* of the same age.

canon are included among the *Hagiographa* or *Holy Writings*, namely, Job, the Psalms, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon. Besides these the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and most of the Prophets are likewise poetic in sentiment and form; and a number of lyric songs, odes, and prophecies, are scattered through the historical books.

The poetic sections of the New Testament are the *Magnificat* of the blessed Virgin, the *Benedictus* of Zachariah, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the *Nunc dimittis* of Simeon, the Parables of our Lord, the Anthems of the Apocalypse, and several poetic quotations in the Epistles, *e. g.*, 1 Tim. iii. 16.

Sometimes the prose of the Bible is equal to the best poetry, and blends truth and beauty in perfect harmony. It approaches also, in touching the highest themes, the rhythmical form of Hebrew poetry, and may be arranged according to the parallelism of members.* Moses was a poet as well as a historian, and every prophet or seer is a poet, though not every poet a prophet. The same is true of the prose of the New Testament. We need only refer to the Beatitudes and the whole Sermon on the Mount, the Parables of our Lord, the Prologue of St. John, the seraphic description of love by St. Paul in the thirteenth chapter of second Corinthians, and his triumphant pæan at the close of the eighth chapter of Romans, which, in the opinion of Erasmus, surpasses the eloquence of Cicero.†

In this wider sense the Bible begins and ends with poetry. The retrospective vision of the first creation, and the prospective vision of the new heavens and the new earth are presented in language which rises to the summit of poetic beauty and power. There can be nothing more pregnant and sublime in thought, and at the same time more terse and classical in expression than the sentence of the Creator:

"Let there be light! And there was light."

Is there a loftier and more inspiring conception of man than that with which the Bible introduces him into the world, as the very image and likeness of the infinite God? And the idea of a paradise of innocence, love and peace at the threshold of history is poetry as well as reality, casting its sunshine over the gloom of the fall, and opening the prospect of a future paradise regained. Then, passing from the first chapters of Genesis to the last of the Apocalypse, how tender and affecting is St. John's description of the new Jerusalem—the inspiring theme of all the hymns of heavenly home-sickness from "*Ad perennis vitæ fontem*" to "Jerusalem the golden," which have cheered so many weary pilgrims on their journey through the desert of life.

Hebrew poetry has always been an essential part of Jewish and Christian worship. The Psalter was the first, and for many centuries the only hymn-book of the Church. It is the most fruitful source of Christian hymnody. Many of the finest English and German hymns are free reproductions of Hebrew psalms; the 23d Psalm alone has furnished the key-note to a large number of Christian hymns, and the 46th Psalm to Luther's master-piece: "*Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott.*"

As among other nations, so among the Jews, poetry was the oldest form of composition. It precedes prose, as youth precedes manhood, and as feeling and imagination are active before sober reflection and logical reasoning.

Poetry and music were closely connected, and accompanied domestic and social life in seasons of joy and sorrow. They cheered the wedding, the harvest, and other feasts (Jos. ix. 3; Jud. xxi. 19; Amos vi. 5; Ps. iv. 8). They celebrated victory after a battle, as the song of Moses, Ex. xv., and the song of Deborah, Judg. v.; they greeted the victor on his return, 1 Sam. xviii. 8. The shepherd sung while watching his flock, the hunter in the pursuit of his prey. Maidens deplored the death of Jephthah's daughter in songs (Judg. xi. 40), and David the death of Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i. 18), and afterwards Abner (2 Sam. iii. 33). Love was the theme of a nobler inspiration than among the sensual Greeks, and the Song

---

* Isaac Taylor says (l. c. p. 68): "Biblical utterances of the first truths in theology possess the grandeur of the loftiest poetry, as well as a rhythmical or artificial structure."

† "*Quid unquam Cicero dixit grandiloquentius?*" The heathen rhetorician, Longinus, placed Paul among the greatest orators.

of Songs celebrates the Hebrew ideal of pure bridal love, as reflecting the love of Jehovah to His people, and prefiguring the union of Christ with His Church.

§ 4. THE SPIRIT OF HEBREW POETRY.

In a wider sense all true poetry is inspired. The civilized nations of antiquity, particularly the Greeks, regarded it as a divine gift, and poets as prophets and intimate friends of the gods; and all the ceremonies, oracles and mysteries of their religion were clothed in poetic dress. There is, however, a two-fold inspiration, a Divine, and a Satanic; and the poetry which administers to pride and sensual passion, idolizes the creature, ridicules virtue, and makes vice attractive, is the product of the evil spirit.

The poetry of the Hebrews is in the highest and best sense the poetry of inspiration and revelation. It is inspired by the genius of the true religion, and hence rises far above the religious poetry of the Hindoos, Parsees and Greeks, as the religion of revelation is above the religion of nature, and the God of the Bible above the idols of the heathen. It is the poetry of truth and holiness. It never administers to trifling vanities and lower passions; it is the chaste and spotless priestess at the altar. It reveals the mysteries of the divine will to man, and offers up man's prayers and thanks to his Maker. It is consecrated to the glory of Jehovah and the moral perfection of man.

The most obvious feature of Bible poetry is its intense Theism. The question of the existence of God is never raised, and an atheist—if there be one—is simply set down as a fool (Ps. xiv.). The Hebrew poet lives and moves in the idea of a living God, as a self-revealing, personal, almighty, holy, omniscient, all-pervading and merciful Being, and overflows with his adoration and praise. He sees and hears God in the works of creation, and in the events of history. Jehovah is to him the Maker and Preserver of all things. He shines in the firmament, He rides on the thunder-storm, He clothes the lilies, He feeds the ravens and young lions, and the cattle on a thousand hills, He gives rain and fruitful seasons. He is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, of Moses, David and the prophets, He dwells with Israel, He is their ever-present help and shield, their comfort and joy, He is just and holy in His judgments, good, merciful and true in all His dealings, He overrules even the wrath of man for His own glory and the good of His people.

To this all-prevailing Theism corresponds the anthropology. Man is always represented under his most important moral and religious relations, in the state of innocence, in the terrible slavery of sin, or in the process of redemption and restoration to more than his original glory and dominion over the creation. Hebrew poetry reflects in fresh and life-like colors the working of God's law and promise on the heart of the pious, and every state of his experience, the deep emotions of repentance and grief, faith and trust, gratitude and praise, hope and aspiration, love and peace.

Another characteristic of Bible poetry is the childlike simplicity and naturalness with which it sets forth and brings home to the heart the sublimest ideas to readers of every grade of culture, who have a lively organ for religious truth.* The scenery and style are thoroughly oriental and Hebrew, and yet they can be translated into every language without losing by the process—which cannot be said of any other poetry. Greek and Roman poetry have more art and variety, more elegance and finish, but no such popularity, catholicity and adaptability. The universal heart of humanity beats in the Hebrew poet. It is true, his experience falls far short of that of the Christian. Yet nearly every phase of Old Testament piety strikes a corresponding chord in the soul of the Christian; and such are the depths of the divine Spirit who guided the genius of the sacred singers that their words convey far more than they themselves were conscious of, and reach prophetically forward into the most distant future.†

* "Not less in relation to the most highly-cultured minds than to the most rude—not less to minds disciplined in abstract thought, than to such as are unused to generalization of any kind—the Hebrew Scriptures, in the metaphoric style, and their poetic diction, are the fittest medium for conveying, what is their purpose to convey, concerning the Divine Nature, and concerning the spiritual life, and concerning the correspondence of man—the finite, with God—the Infinite." This idea is well carried out in the work of Isaac Taylor, see p. 50.

† The higher order of secular poetry furnishes an analogy. Shakespeare was not aware of the deep and far-reaching

All this applies more particularly to the Psalter, the holy of holies in Hebrew poetry. David, "the singer of Israel," was placed by Providence in the different situations of shepherd, courtier, outlaw, warrior, conqueror, king, that he might the more vividly set forth Jehovah as the Good Shepherd, the ever-present Helper, the mighty Conqueror, the just and merciful Sovereign. He was open to all the emotions of friendship and love, generosity and mercy; he enjoyed the highest joys and honors; he suffered poverty, persecution and exile, the loss of the dearest friend, treason and rebellion from his own son. Even his changing moods and passions, his sins and crimes, which with their swift and fearful punishments form a domestic tragedy of rare terror and pathos, were overruled and turned into lessons of humility, comfort and gratitude. All this rich spiritual biography from his early youth to his old age, together with God's merciful dealings with him, are written in his hymns, though with reference to his inward states of mind rather than his outward condition, so that readers of very different situation or position in life might yet be able to sympathize with the feelings and emotions expressed. His hymns give us a deeper glance into his inmost heart and his secret communion with God than the narrative of his life in the historical books. They are remarkable for simplicity, freshness, vivacity, warmth, depth and vigor of feeling, childlike tenderness and heroic faith, and the all-pervading fear and love of God. "In all his works," says the author of Ecclesiasticus (xl. 8-12), he praised the Holy One most high with words of glory; with his whole heart he sang songs, and loved Him that made him. He set singers also before the altar, that by their voices they might make sweet melody and daily sing praises in their songs. He beautified their feasts and set in order the solemn times until the end, that they might praise His holy name, and that the temple might sound from morning. The Lord took away his sins and exalted his horn forever; He gave him a covenant of kings and the throne of glory in Israel."*

This inseparable union with religion, with truth and holiness, gives to Hebrew poetry such an enduring charm and undying power for good in all ages and countries.† It brings us into the immediate presence of the great Jehovah, it raises us above the miseries of earth, it dispels the clouds of darkness, it inspires, ennobles, purifies and imparts peace and joy, it gives us a foretaste of heaven itself.

In this respect the poetry of the Bible is as far above classic poetry as the Bible itself is above all other books. Homer and Virgil dwindle into utter insignificance as compared with David and Asaph, if we look to the moral effect upon the heart and the life of their readers. The classic poets reach only a small and cultured class; but the singers of the Bible come home to men of every grade of education, every race and color, every condition of life, and every creed and sect. The Psalter is, as Luther calls it, "a manual of all the saints," where

---

meaning of his own productions. Goethe said that the deepest element in poetry is "the unconscious" (*das Unbewusste*), and that his master-piece, the tragedy of Faust, proceeded from the dark and hidden depths of his being.

* Comp. Ewald's admirable portrait of David as a poet, in the first volume of *Die Dichter des A. B.*, p. 25. Prof. Perowne in his Commentary on the *Psalms*, vol. I., pp. 8, 9 third ed. (1873), gives this truthful description of him: "As David's life shines in his poetry, so also does his character. That character was no common one. It was strong with all the strength of man, tender with all the tenderness of woman. Naturally brave, his courage was heightened and confirmed by that faith in God which never, in the worst extremity, forsook him. Naturally warm-hearted, his affections struck their roots deep into the innermost centre of his being. In his love for his parents, for whom he provided in his own extreme peril—in his love for his wife Michal—for his friend Jonathan, whom he loved as his own soul—for his darling Absalom, whose death almost broke his heart—even for the infant whose loss he dreaded—we see the same man, the same depth and truth, the same tenderness of personal affection. On the other hand, when stung by a sense of wrong or injustice, his sense of which was peculiarly keen, he could flash out into strong words and strong deeds. He could hate with the same fervor that he loved. Evil men and evil things, all that was at war with goodness and with God—for these he found no abhorrence too deep, scarcely any imprecations too strong. Yet he was, withal, placable and ready to forgive. He could exercise a prudent self-control, if he was occasionally impetuous. His true courtesy, his chivalrous generosity to his foes, his rare delicacy, his rare self-denial, are all traits which present themselves most forcibly as we read his history. He is the truest of heroes in the genuine elevation of his character, no less than in the extraordinary incidents of his life. Such a man cannot wear a mask in his writings. Depth, tenderness, fervor, mark all his poems."

† Winer, too, derives from the religious character of Hebrew poetry its "sublime flight and never-dying beauty." Angus says: "The peculiar excellence of the Hebrew poetry is to be ascribed to the employment of it in the noblest service, that of religion. It presents the loftiest and most precious truths, expressed in the most appropriate language." Ewald remarks that "Hebrew poetry is the interpreter of the sublimest religious ideas for all times, and herein lies its most important and imperishable value."

each one finds the most truthful description of his own situation, especially in seasons of affliction. It has retained its hold upon the veneration and affections of pious Jews and Christians for these three thousand years, and is even now and will ever be more extensively used as a guide of private devotion and public worship than any other book. "When Christian Martyrs, and Scottish Covenanters in dens and caves of the earth, when French exiles and English fugitives in their hiding-places during the panic of revolution or of mutiny, received a special comfort from the Psalms, it was because they found themselves literally side by side with the author in the cavern of Adullam, or on the cliffs of Engedi, or beyond the Jordan, escaping from Saul or from Absalom, from the Philistines or from the Assyrians. When Burleigh or Locke seemed to find an echo in the Psalms to their own calm philosophy, it was because they were listening to the strains which had proceeded from the mouth or charmed the ear of the sagacious king or the thoughtful statesman of Judah. It has often been observed that the older we grow, the more interest the Psalms possess for us as individuals; and it may at most be said that by these multiplied associations, the older the human race grows, the more interest do they possess for mankind."*

§ 5. POETIC MERIT.

In its religious character, as just described, lies the crowning excellence of the poetry of the Bible. The spiritual ideas are the main thing, and they rise in richness, purity, sublimity and universal importance immeasurably beyond the literature of all other nations of antiquity.

But as to the artistic and æsthetic form, it is altogether subordinate to the contents, and held in subserviency to the lofty aim. Moses, Solomon, David, Isaiah, and the author of Job, possessed evidently the highest gifts of poetry, but they restrained them, lest human genius should outshine the Divine grace, or the silver pitcher be estimated above the golden apple. The poetry of the Bible, like the whole Bible, wears the garb of humility and condescends to men of low degree, in order to raise them up. It gives no encouragement to the idolatry of genius, and glorifies God alone. "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy name give glory," (Ps cxv. 1.)

Hence an irreligious or immoral man is apt to be repelled by the Bible; he feels himself in an uncongenial atmosphere, and is made uneasy and uncomfortable by the rebukes of sin and the praise of a holy God. He will not have this book rule over him or disturb him in his worldly modes of thought and habits of life.

Others are unable to divest themselves of early prejudices for classical models; they esteem external polish more highly than ideas, and can enjoy no poetry which is not cast in the Greek mould, and moves on in the regular flow of uniform metre and stanza. And yet these are no more essential to true poetry than the music of rhyme, which was unknown to Homer, Pindar, Sophocles, Virgil and Horace, and was even despised by Milton as "the invention of a barbarous age to set off wretched matter and lame metre, as the jingling sound of like endings trivial to all judicious ears and of no true musical delight." This is indeed going to the opposite extreme; for although rhyme and even metre are by no means necessary, especially in the epos and drama, they yet belong to the *perfection* of some forms of *lyric* poetry, which is the twin sister of music.

If we study the Bible poetry on its own ground, and with unclouded eyes, we may find in it forms of beauty as high and enduring as in that of any nation ancient or modern. Even its artless simplicity and naturalness are sometimes the highest triumph of art. Simplicity always enters into good taste. Those poems and songs which are the outgushing of the heart, without any show of artificial labor, are the most popular, and never lose their hold on the heart. We feel that we could have made them ourselves, and yet only a high order of genius could produce them.

Where is there a nobler ode of liberty, of national deliverance and independence, than the Song of Moses on the overthrow of Pharaoh in the Red Sea (Ex. xv.)? Where a grander

* Stanley: *Hist. of the Jewish Church*, II. 167.

panorama of creation than in the one hundred and fourth Psalm? Where a more charming and lovely pastoral than the twenty-third Psalm? Where such a high view of the dignity and destiny of man as in the eighth Psalm? Where a profounder sense of sin and divine forgiveness than in the thirty-second and fifty-first Psalms? Where such a truthful and overpowering description of the vanity of human life and the never-changing character of the holy and just, yet merciful God, as in the ninetieth Psalm, which has been styled "the most sublime of human compositions, the deepest in feeling, loftiest in theologic conception, the most magnificent in its imagery?" Where have the infinite greatness and goodness of God, His holiness, righteousness, long-suffering and mercy, the wonders of His government, and the feeling of dependence on Him, of joy and peace in Him, of gratitude for His blessings, of praise of His glory, found truer and fitter embodiment than in the Psalter and the Prophets? Where will you find such sweet, tender, delicate and exquisite expression of pure innocent love as in the Song of Songs, which sounds like the singing of birds in sunny May from the flowery fields and the tree of life in Paradise? Isaiah is one of the greatest of poets as well as of prophets, of an elevation, a richness, a compass, a power and comfort that are unequalled. No human genius ever soared so high as this evangelist of the old dispensation. Jeremiah, the prophet of sorrow and affliction, has furnished the richest supply of the language of holy grief in seasons of public calamity and distress from the destruction of Jerusalem down to the latest siege of Paris; and few works have done this work more effectively than his *Lamentations.* And what shall we say of the Book of Job, the Shakspeare in the Bible? Where are such bold and vivid descriptions of the wonders of nature, of the behemoth and leviathan, and of the war-horse "who paweth in the valley and rejoiceth in his strength, who swalloweth the ground with fierceness and rage, who saith among the trumpets Ha, ha! and smelleth the battle afar off, the thunder of the captains and the shout of war?" What can be finer than Job's picture of wisdom, whose price is far above rubies? And what a wealth of comfort is in that wonderful passage, which inspired the sublimest solo in the sublimest musical composition, those words graven in the rock forever, where this holy outsider, this patriarchal sage and saint of the order of Melchisedec, expresses his faith and hope that his Redeemer liveth and will stand the last on the grave, and that he shall see Him with his own eyes on the morning of resurrection.

The times for the depreciation of Bible poetry have passed. Many of the greatest scholars and poets, some of whom by no means in sympathy with its religious ideas, have done it full justice. I quote a few of them who represent different stand-points and nationalities.

Henry Stephens, the greatest philologist of the sixteenth century, thought that there was nothing more poetic (*ποιητικώτερον*), nothing more musical (*μουσικώτερον*), nothing more thrilling (*γοργώτερον*), nothing more full of lofty inspiration (*διθυραμβικώτερον*) than the Psalms of David.

John Milton, notwithstanding his severe classic taste, judges: "There are no songs comparable to the songs of Zion, no orations equal to those of the Prophets, and no politics like those which the Scriptures teach." And as to the Psalms, he says: "Not in their divine arguments alone, but in the very critical art of composition, the Psalms may be easily made to appear over all the kinds of lyric poesy incomparable."

Sir William Jones: "I have regularly and attentively read the Holy Scriptures, and am of the opinion that this volume, independently of its divine origin, contains more true sublimity, more exquisite beauty, more important history and finer strains both of poetry and eloquence, than could be collected from all other books."

Sir D. K. Sandford: "In lyric flow and fire, in crushing force and majesty, the poetry of the ancient Scriptures is the most superb that ever burnt within the breast of man."

John von Müller, the German Tacitus: "There is nothing in Greece, nothing in Rome, nothing in all the West, like David, who selected the God of Israel to sing Him in higher strains than ever praised the gods of the Gentiles."

Herder, who was at home in the literature of all ages and countries, is full of enthusiastic admiration for the pure and sublime beauties of Hebrew poetry, as may be seen on almost every page of his celebrated work on the subject. He regards it as "the oldest, sim-

plest, sublimest" of all poetry, and in the form of a dialogue between Alciphron and Euty-phron, after the Platonic fashion, he triumphantly vindicates its merits against all objections, and illustrates it with admirable translations of choice passages.

Goethe pronounced the book of Ruth "the loveliest thing in the shape of an epic or idyl which has come down to us."

Alexander von Humboldt, in his "Cosmos," (where the name of God scarcely occurs, except in an extract from the heathen Aristotle), praises the Hebrew description of nature as unrivalled, especially the 104th Psalm, as "presenting in itself a picture of the whole world." "Nature," he says, "is to the Hebrew poet not a self-dependent object, but a work of creation and order, the living expression of the omnipresence of the Divinity in the visible world."

Thomas Carlyle calls the book of Job, "apart from all theories about it, one of the grandest things ever written by man. A noble book! All men's book! Such living likenesses were never since drawn. Sublime sorrow, sublime reconciliation; oldest choral melody, as of the heart of manhood; so soft and great as the summer midnight; as the world with its seas and stars. There is nothing written, I think, of equal literary merit."

Isaac Taylor: "The Hebrew writers as poets were masters of all the means and the resources, the powers and the stores, of the loftiest poetry, but subservient to a far loftier purpose than that which ever animates human genius."

Henry Ewald calls the old Hebrew poetry "unique in its kind and in many respects unsurpassed, because as to its contents it is the interpreter of those sublime religious thoughts which lived in Israel, and are found nowhere else in antiquity in such purity, vigor and durability, and as to its form it has a wonderful simplicity and naivete flowing from that sublimity of thought."

Dean Stanley: "The Psalms are beyond question poetical from first to last, and he will be a bold man who shall say that a book is less inspired, or less true, or less orthodox, or less Divine, because it is like the Psalms. The Prophet, in order to take root in the common life of the people, must become a Psalmist."

J. J. Stewart Perowne: "The very excellence of the Psalms is their universality. They spring from the deep fountains of the human heart, and God, in His providence, and by His Spirit, has so ordered it, that they should be for His Church an everlasting heritage. Hence they express the sorrows, the joys, the aspirations, the struggles, the victories, not of one man, but of all. And if we ask, How comes this to pass? the answer is not far to seek. One object is ever before the eyes and the heart of the Psalmist. All enemies, all distresses, all persecutions, all sins, are seen in the light of God. It is to Him that the cry goes up; it is to Him that the heart is laid bare; it is to Him that the thanksgiving is uttered. This it is which makes them so true, so precious, so universal. No surer proof of their inspiration can be given than this, that they are 'not of an age but for all time,' that the ripest Christian can use them in the fulness of his Christian manhood, though the words are the words of one who lived centuries before the coming of Christ in the flesh."

§ 6. DIFFERENT KINDS OF HEBREW POETRY.

Hebrew poetry may be divided into *lyric didactic*, *prophetic*, and *dramatic*. The first two are the prevailing forms. The third may be regarded as a branch of didactic poetry, or perhaps better, as a substitute for epic poetry. The fourth is not to be confounded with the Greek drama, and is in close connection either with the lyric or didactic. Hence many writers admit only these two.*

The absence of epic poetry in its proper sense is due to the fact that the revealed religion excludes mythology and hero-worship, which control this kind of poetry, and that it substitutes for them monotheism, which is inconsistent with any kind of falsehood and idolatry. The real hero, so to speak, of the history of revelation is Jehovah Himself, the only true

* So Perowne (*The Book of Psalms*, Vol. I., p. 1, third ed.): "The poetry of the Hebrews is mainly of two kinds, lyrical and didactic. They have no epic, and no drama. Dramatic elements are to be found in many of their odes, and the Book of Job and the Song of Songs have sometimes been called Divine dramas; but dramatic poetry, in the proper sense of that term, was altogether unknown to the Israelites."

and living God, to whom all glory is due. And so He appears in the prophetic writings. He is the one object of worship, praise and thanksgiving, but not the object of a narrative poem. He is the one sovereign actor, who in heaven originates and controls all events on earth, but not one among other actors, co-operating or conflicting with finite beings. Epic poetry reproduces historic facts at the expense of truth, and exalts its hero above merit. The Bible poetry never violates truth.

There are, however, epic elements in several lyric poems which celebrate certain great events in Jewish history, as the Song of Moses, Exod. xv., and the Song of Deborah, Judg. v.; although even here the lyric element preponderates, and the subjectivity of the poet is not lost in the objective event as in the genuine epos. The Book of Ruth has been called an epic by Göthe. The Prologue and Epilogue of Job are epic, and have a truly narrative and objective character; but they are only the framework of the poem itself, which is essentially didactic in dramatic form. In the apocryphal books the epic element appears in the book of Tobith and the book of Judith, which stand between narrative and fiction, and correspond to what we call romance or novel.

§ 7. LYRIC POETRY.

Lyric poetry, or the poetry of feeling, is the oldest and predominant form of poetry among the Hebrew as all other Semitic nations. It is the easiest, the most natural, and the best adapted for devotion both private and public. It is closely connected with song, its twin sister. It wells up from the human heart, and gives utterance to its many strong and tender emotions of love and friendship, of joy and gladness, of grief and sorrow, of hope and desire, of gratitude and praise. Ewald happily describes it as "the daughter of the moment, of swift, rising, powerful feelings, of deep stirrings and fiery emotions of the soul."*

Among the Greeks the epos appears first; but the older lyric effusions may have been lost. Among the Hindoos they are preserved in the Vedas. Lyric poetry is found among all nations which have a poetic literature; but epic poetry, at least in its fuller development, is not so general, and hence cannot be the primitive form.

Lyric poetry contains the fruitful germ of all other kinds of poetry. When the poetic feeling is kindled by a great event in history, it expresses itself more or less epically, as in the battle and victory hymns of Moses and Deborah. When the poet desires to teach a great truth or practical lesson, he becomes didactic. When he exhibits his emotions in the form of action and real life, he approaches the drama. In like manner the lyric poetry may give rise to mixed forms which appear in the later stages of literature.†

The oldest specimen of lyric poetry is the song of Lamech to his two wives (Gen. iv. 23). It has already the measured arrangement, alliteration and musical correspondence of Hebrew parallelism. It is a proud, fierce, defiant "sword-song," commemorating in broken, fragmentary utterances the invention of weapons of brass and iron by his son *Tubal Cain* (*i. e.*, lance-maker), and threatening vengeance:

> Adah and Zillah! hear my voice,
> Ye wives of Lamech, listen to my speech:

* *Dichter des A. B.* I., p. 17: "*Die lyrische Dichtung oder das Lied ist überall die nächste Art von Dichtung, welche bei irgend einem Volke entsteht. Sie ist es ihrem Wesen nach: denn sie ist die Tochter des Augenblicks, schnell emporkommender gewaltiger Empfindungen, tiefer Rührungen und feuriger Bewegungen des Gemüthes, von welchen der Dichter so ganz hingerissen ist, dass er in sich wie verloren nichts als sie so gewaltig wie sie in ihm leben, aussprechen will. Sie ist es ebenso der Zeit nach: das kurze Lied ist der beständigste, unverwüstlichste Theil von Poesie, der erste und letzte Erguss dichterischer Stimmung, wie eine unversiegbare Quelle, welche zu jeder Zeit sich wieder frisch ergiessen kann. Sie ist also auch bei allen Völkern nothwendig die älteste, die welche zuerst eine dichterische Gestaltung und Kunst gründet und allen übrigen Arten von Dichtung die Wege bahnt.*" On p. 91 Ewald says: "*Und so bleibt das Lied in seinem ganzen reinen und vollen Wesen wie der Anfang so das Ende aller Dichtung.*"

† Ewald, l. c., p. 1 *g*: "*Der besondere Zweck, welchen der Dichter verfolgen mag, kann im Allgemeinen nur ein dreifacher sein: er will entweder mit seinen geflügelten Worten wie mit einer Lehre andre treffen, oder er will erzählend beschreiben, oder endlich er will das volle Leben selbst ebenso lebendig wiedergeben: und so werden* LEHRDICHTUNG, SAGENDICHTUNG (*Epos*) *und* LEBENSDICHTUNG (*Drama*) *die drei Arten höherer Dichtung sein, welche sich überall wie von selbst ausbilden wollen. Erst wenn sie sich vollkommen aus gebildet haben, entstehen auch wohl neue* ZWITTERARTEN, *indem das Lied als die Urart aller Dichtung seine eigenthümliche Weise mit einer derselben neu verschmilzt und diese stets nächste und allgegenwärtigste Urdichtung sich so in neuer Schöpfung mannichfach verjüngt.*"

For I have slain* a man for wounding me,
Even a young man for hurting me.
Lo! Cain shall be avenged seven-fold,
But Lamech seventy and seven-fold.†

Here we have the origin of *secular* poetry and music (for the other son of Lamech, *Jubal*, *i. e.*, *Harper*, invented musical instruments), in connection with the progressive material civilization of the descendants of Cain.

The other poetic remains of the ante-Mosaic age are the Prediction of Noah concerning his three sons (Gen. ix. 25-27), and the death-chant of Jacob (Gen. xlix. 1-27); but these belong rather to prophetic poetry.

In the Mosaic age we meet first with the song of deliverance which Moses sang with the children of Israel unto the Lord after the overthrow of Pharaoh's hosts in the Red Sea (Ex. xv. 1–19). It is the oldest specimen of a patriotic ode (from *ὀείδειν*, *to sing*), and may be called the national anthem, or the *Te Deum* of the Hebrews. It sounds through all the thanksgiving hymns of Israel, and is associated by the Apocalyptic Seer with the final triumph of the Church, when the saints shall sing "the song of Moses, and the song of the Lamb" (Rev. xv. 3). Its style is archaic, simple and grand. It is arranged for antiphonal singing, chorus answering to chorus, and voice to voice; the maidens playing upon the timbrels. It is full of alliterations and rhymes which cannot be rendered, and hence it necessarily loses in any translation.‡

I will sing unto Jehovah,
  For He hath triumphed gloriously:
The horse and his rider
  Hath He thrown into the sea.

Jehovah is my strength and song,
  And He is become my salvation.
This is my God, and I will praise Him;§
  My father's God, and I will exalt Him.

Jehovah is a man of war;
  Jehovah is His name.
Pharaoh's chariots and his hosts
  Hath He cast into the sea:

---

* The perfect, *I have slain* (הָרַגְתִּי, Sept. ἀπέκτεινα, Vulg. *occidi*), is probably used in the spirit of arrogant boasting, to express the future with all the certainty of an accomplished fact. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, Jarchi and others set Lamech down as a murderer (of Cain), who here confesses his deed to ease his conscience; but Aben-Ezra, Calvin, Herder, Ewald, Delitzsch, take the verb as a threat: "I will slay any man who wounds me."

† The law of blood for blood is strongly expressed also in the tragic poetry of Greece, especially in the *Eumenides* of Æschylus, also the *Chœphoræ*, 398 (quoted by Prof. T. Lewis, Com. on *Gen. in loc.*):

"There is a law that blood once poured on earth
By murderous hands demands that other blood
Be shed in retribution. From the slain
Erynnys calls aloud for vengeance still,
Till death in justice meet be paid for death."

‡ Herder says of this poem, of which he gives a free German translation: "*Der Durchgang durchs Meer hat das älteste und klingendste Siegeslied hervorgebracht, das wir in dieser Sprache haben. Es ist Chorgesang: eine einzelne Stimme malte vielleicht die Thaten selbst, die der Chor auffing und gleichsam verhallte. Sein Bau ist einfach, voll Assonanzen und Reime, die ich in unsrer Sprache ohne Wortzwang nicht zu geben wüsste; denn die ebræische Sprache ist wegen ihres einförmigen Baues solcher klingenden Assonanzen voll Leichte, lange, aber wenige Worte verschweben in der Luft, und meistens endigt ein dunkler, einsylbiger Schall, der vielleicht den Bardit des Chors machte.*" Dr. Lange thus happily characterizes this ode (*Comm. on Ex.*): "*Wie der Durchgang durch das Rothe Meer als eine fundementale Thatsache des typischen Reiches Gottes seine Beziehung durch die ganze Heilige Schrift ausbreitet, wie er sich rückwärts auf die Sündfluth bezieht, weiter vorwärts auf die christliche Taufe, und schliesslich auf das Endgericht, so gehen auch die Reflexe von diesem Liede Moses durch die ganze Heilige Schrift. Rückwärts ist es vorbereitet durch die poetischen Laute der Genesis und durch den Segen Jakobs, vorwärts geht es durch kleine epische Laute über auf das Abschiedslied des Moses und seinen Segen* 5 *Mos.* 32, 33. *Zwei grossartige Seitenstücke, welche folgen, das Siegeslied der Debora und das Rettungslied des David* 2 *Sam.* 22 (*Ps.* 18), *leiten dann die Psalmen-poesie ein, in welcher vielfach der Grundton unsres Liedes wieder mit anklingt, Pss.* 77, 78, 105, 106, 114. *Noch einmal ist am Schlusse des N. T. von dem Liede Mosis die Rede; es tönt fort als das typische Triumphlied des Volkes Gottes bis in die andre Welt hinein, Offenb.* 15, 3."

§ The E. V.: 'I will prepare Him an habitation' (sanctuary), would anticipate the building of the tabernacle, but is not justified by the Hebrew.

And his chosen captains
  Are sunk in the Red Sea.
The depths cover them.
  They went down to the bottom like a stone.

Thy right hand, O Jehovah, glorious in power,
  Thy right hand, O Jehovah, dasheth in pieces the enemy.
And in the greatness of Thy majesty
  Thou overturnest them that rise up against thee:
Thou sendest forth Thy wrath,
  It consumeth them like stubble.
And with the blast of Thy nostrils the waters were piled up.
  The floods stood upright as an heap.
  The depths were congealed in the heart of the sea.

The enemy said, I will pursue, I will overtake,
  I will divide the spoil,
My soul shall be satisfied upon them;
  I will draw my sword,
  My hand shall destroy them.

Thou didst blow with Thy wind,
  The sea covered them:
  They sank as lead in the mighty waters.

Who is like unto Thee, O Jehovah, among the gods?
  Who is like Thee, glorious in holiness,
  Fearful in praises, doing wonders?
Thou stretchedst out Thy right hand,
  The earth swallowed them.

Thou in Thy mercy hast led the people
  Which Thou hast redeemed.
Thou hast guided them in thy strength
  To thy holy habitation.

The peoples have heard, they tremble:*
  Pangs have taken hold on the inhabitants of Philistia.
Then were the chiefs of Edom dismayed.
  The mighty men of Moab, trembling taketh hold upon them.
All the inhabitants of Canaan are melted away;
  Terror and dread fall upon them.
By the greatness of Thine arm they are as still as a stone;
  Till Thy people pass over, O Jehovah,
Till the people pass over,
  Which Thou hast purchased.

Thou shalt bring them in,
  And plant them in the mountain of Thine inheritance.
The place, O Jehovah, which Thou hast made for Thee to dwell in,
  The sanctuary, O Jehovah, which Thou hast established.
Jehovah shall reign for ever and ever.

Here the song ends, and what follows (ver. 19) is probably a brief recapitulation to fix the event in the memory:

For the horses of Pharaoh went in with his chariots
  And with his horsemen into the sea,
And Jehovah brought again the waters of the sea upon them;
  But the children of Israel walked on dry land
  In the midst of the sea.

Moses wrote also that sublime farewell-song which celebrates Jehovah's merciful dealings with Israel (Deut. xxxii.), the parting blessing of the twelve tribes (Deut. xxxiii.), and the ninetieth Psalm, called "A Prayer of Moses, the man of God," which sums up the spiritual experience of his long pilgrimage in the wilderness, and which proves its undying force at every death-bed and funeral service.

* The poet now, after giving thanks for the past, looks to the future and describes the certain consequences of this mighty deliverance, which struck terror into the hearts of all enemies of Israel, and must end in the conquest of Canaan, as promised by God.

In the book of Joshua (x. 12, 13) there is a poetic quotation from "the Book of the Upright," which was probably a collection of patriotic songs:

"Sun, stand still upon Gibeon,
  And thou, moon, upon the valley of Ajalon!"
And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed her course,
  Until the nation were avenged of their enemies.

The song of Deborah (Judges v.), from the heroic period of the Judges, eight centuries before Pindar, is a stirring battle-song full of fire and dithyrambic swing, and breathing the spirit of an age of disorder and tumult, when might was right.*

Another but very different specimen of female poetry is Hannah's hymn of joy and gratitude when she dedicated her son Samuel, the last of the Judges, to the service of Jehovah (1 Sam. ii. 1–10). It furnished the key-note to the *Magnificat* of the Virgin Mary after the miraculous conception.

The reign of David was the golden age of lyric poetry. He was himself the prince of singers in Israel. His religious poetry is incorporated in the Psalter. Of his secular poetry the author of the Books of Samuel has preserved us two specimens, a brief stanza on the death of Abner, and his lament for the death of Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i. 19–27). The latter is a most pathetic and touching elegy full of the strength and tenderness of the love of friendship. His generosity in lamenting the death of his persecutor who stood in his way to the throne, enhances the beauty and effect of the elegy.

Thy Glory, O Israel,† is slain upon thy heights.
(CHORUS) *How are the heroes fallen!*

Tell it not in Gath,
  Publish it not in the streets of Askelon;
Lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice,
  Lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph.

Ye mountains of Gilboa, no dew nor rains
  Come upon you, and ye fields of offerings.‡
For there the shield of the hero is polluted,§
  The shield of Saul not anointed with oil.‖

From the blood of the slain, from the fat of the heroes,
  The bow of Jonathan turned not back,
And the sword of Saul
  Returned not empty.

---

* An admirable German translation is given by Herder, and another by Prof. Cassel, in his *Com. on Judges*, translated by Prof. Steenstra.

† Or: "The Glory (the Beauty) of Israel." Ewald, Bunsen, Keil, take יִשְׂרָאֵל, as vocative, "O Israel;" the E. V. ("the beauty of Israel"), De Wette, Erdmann (*Die Zierde Israels*), and others, as genitive. צְבִי means *splendor*, *glory* (Isa. iv. 2; xiii. 19; xxiv. 16, and is often used of the land of Israel, and of Mount Zion, which is called "the mountain of holy beauty," הַר צְבִי קֹדֶשׁ, Dan. xi. 45); also a *gazelle*, from the beauty of its form (1 Kings v. 3; Isa. xiii. 14). The gazelles were so much admired by the Hebrews and Arabs that they even swore by them (Cant. ii. 7; iii. 5). Herder (*Israel's Reh*), and Ewald (*Der Steinbock*, *Israel*—to avoid the feminine *die Gazelle*) take it in the latter sense, and refer it to Jonathan alone. Ewald conjectures that Jonathan was familiarly known among the soldiers of Israel as *the Gazelle* on account of his beauty and swiftness. Jonathan was, of course, much nearer to the heart of the poet, but in this national song David had to identify him with Saul, so that both are included in the Glory of Israel.

‡ שְׂדֵי תְרוּמֹת, Sept. ἀγροὶ ἀπαρχῶν, Vulg. *neque sint agri primitiarum*, fertile fields from which the first fruits are gathered. The E. V. renders with Jerome: "*nor* (*let there be*) fields of offerings." On the different interpretations and conjectures see Erdmann in Lange's *Com.* It is a poetical malediction or imprecation of such complete barrenness that not even enough may grow on that bloody field for an offering of first-fruits.

§ By blood and dust. A great indignity to a soldier. Homer says that the helmet of Patroclus was rolled under the horses' feet, and soiled with blood and dust (Il. xvi. 794). The E. V., following the Vulgate (*abjectus*), translates נִגְעַל *vilely cast away*.

‖ *But with blood.* The E. V., following again the Vulgate (*quasi non esset*), supplies "*as though he had* not *been* anointed," *i. e.*, as if he had not been a king (1 Sam. x. 1). So also Herder: "*Königes Schild, als wär er nimmer mit Oel geheiligt.*" But the more natural interpretation is: "the shield of Saul *was not* anointed with oil," as was usual in preparation for battle, and after it had been polluted by blood or corrupted by rust (Isa. xxi. 5). The unanointed shield here is an emblem of utter defeat and helplessness.

Saul and Jonathan, lovely and pleasant in their lives,
  And in their death they are not divided.
They were swifter than eagles,
  They were stronger than lions.

Ye daughters of Israel, weep over Saul,
  Who clothed you in purple with delight,
Who put ornaments of gold
  Upon your apparel.*

(CHORUS) *How are the heroes fallen in the midst of the battle!*
O Jonathan, slain upon thy heights!

I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan,
  Very pleasant hast thou been unto me:
Thy love to me was wonderful,
  Passing the love of women.†

(CHORUS) *How are the heroes fallen,‡*
And the weapons of war § perished.

Lyric poetry flourished during the reigns of David and Solomon, then declined with the decline of the nation, and revived for a short period with the restoration of the temple and the theocracy, when the harps were taken from the willows to accompany again the songs of Zion. It is altogether improbable that the Psalter contains hymns of the Maccabæan age, as Hitzig conjectures. The canon was closed long before (B. C. 450).‖

The *Magnificat* of the Virgin Mary, the *Benedictus* of Zacharias, and the *Nunc dimittis* of Simeon are the golden sunset of Hebrew psalmody, and the dawn of Christian hymnody.

The various kinds of lyric poetry are designated by the following names, which occur in the titles of the Psalms:¶

Shîr (Sept. ᾠδή), song for the voice alone.

Mizmôr (Sept. ψαλμός), psalm, song of praise, with instrumental accompaniment (μέλος).

Maschîl (συνέσεως, εἰς σύνεσιν), a skilfully constructed ode, a reflective, contemplative, didactic song.

Michtham (στηλογραφία, or εἰς στηλογραφίαν, lit., song of inscription), a golden poem, or a song of mysterious, deep import. (Delitzsch: catch-word poem).

Shiggaion, an excited, irregular, dithyrambic ode.

Thehillah, a hymn of praise. The plural *thehillîm* is the Hebrew title of the Psalter.

Thephillah, a prayer in song. (Pss. xvii., lxxxvi., xc., cxlii., Hab. iii.).

Shîr jedîdoth, song of loves, erotic poem (Ps. xlv.).

Shîr hamma'aloth (Sept. ᾠδὴ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν, Vulg. *canticum graduum*, E. V. "song of degrees'), most probably a song of the goings up, *i. e.*, pilgrim song for the journeys to the yearly festivals of Jerusalem.

* Lowth: "This passage is most exquisite composition. The women of Israel are most happily introduced, and the subject of the encomium is most admirably adapted to the female characters."

† The sweet, tender, devoted, enduring love with which women love. A picture of the ideal of friendship sanctified by the consecration of their hearts to Jehovah. The Vulgate inserts here the clause: *Sicut mater unicum amat filium suum, ita ego te amabam*, which has no foundation either in the Hebrew or the Septuagint.

‡ The repetition of this lament, probably by the chorus, is entirely in keeping with the nature of an elegy, which likes to dwell upon the grief, and finds relief by its repeated utterance.

§ The כְּלֵי מִלְחָמָה are the heroes themselves, as the living weapons of war. So Ewald and Erdmann (*die Rüstzeuge des Streits*). Comp. Isa. xlii. 5; Acts ix. 15, where St. Paul is called "a chosen vessel" (σκεῦος). It is less lively and poetic to understand it literally of the material of war, as the Vulgate does (*arma bellica*), and Herder who renders:

Ach, wie fielen die Helden und ihre Waffen des Krieges
Liegen zerschlagen umher.

‖ Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Keil, among the orthodox divines, Gesenius, Ewald, Thenius, Dillmann, among the liberal critics, deny the possibility of Maccabæan Psalms. Ewald says (Preface to third ed. of his *Com. on the Ps.*) against Hitzig: "Nothing can be more false and perverse than to suppose that there can be Maccabæan poems in the Psalter." Delitzsch (*Com. über den Psalter*, new ed. 1867, p. 9) admits the possibility, but denies the existence of such late Psalms.

¶ For particulars on the names and musical titles in the inscriptions of the Psalms, some of which are very obscure and variously interpreted, we must refer to the commentaries of Ewald, Hitzig, Delitzsch, Moll (in Lange), and Perowne.

Kinah (ϑρῆνος), a lament, dirge, elegy.* Here belong the laments of David for Saul and Jonathan, 2 Sam. i. 19-27, for Abner (2 Sam. iii. 33, 34), and for Absalom (2 Sam. xviii. 33), the psalms of mourning over the disasters of Judah, Ps. xlix., lx., lxxiii., cxxxvii.), and the Lamentations of Jeremiah.

The PSALTER is the great depository of the religious lyric poetry of the Jewish Church, and the inexhaustible fountain of devotion for all ages. The titles are not original, but contain the ancient Jewish traditions more or less valuable concerning the authorship, historical occasion, musical character, liturgical use of the Psalms. Seventy-three poems are ascribed to David (לדוד);† twelve to Asaph (לאסף), one of David's musicians (Ps. l., lxxiii.-lxxxiii.); eleven or twelve to the sons of Korah, a family of priests and singers of the age of David Pss. xlii.–xlix., lxxxiv., lxxxv,, lxxxvii., lxxxviii.); one to Heman the Ezrahite (lxxxviii.);‡ one to Ethan the Ezrahite (lxxxix.); two to Solomon (lxxii., cxxvii.); one to Moses (xc.); while fifty are anonymous and hence called *Orphan* Psalms in the Talmud. The Septuagint assigns some of them to Jeremiah (cxxxvii.), Haggai and Zechariah (cxlvi., cxlvii.).

The PSALTER is divided into five books, and the close of each is indicated by a doxology and a double *Amen*. In this division several considerations seem to have been combined—authorship and chronology, liturgical use, the distinction of the divine names (Elohistic and Jehovistic Psalms), perhaps also the five-fold division of the Thorah (the Psalter being, as Delitzsch says, the subjective response or echo from the heart of Israel to the law of God). We have an analogy in Christian hymn- and tune-books, which combine the order of subjects and the order of the ecclesiastical year, modifying both by considerations of convenience, and often adding one or more appendixes. The five books represent the gradual growth of the collection till its completion after the exile, about the time of Ezra. The collection of first book, consisting chiefly of Psalms of David, may be traced to Solomon, who would naturally provide for the preservation of his father's poetry, or, at all events, to King Hezekiah, who "commanded the Levites to sing praise unto the Lord with the words of David and of Asaph, the Seer" (2 Chron. xxi. 30; Prov. xxxv. 1).

If we regard chiefly the contents, we may divide the Psalms into Psalms of praise and adoration, Psalms of thanksgiving, Psalms of faith and hope under affliction,§ penitential Psalms, didactic Psalms, historic Psalms, Pilgrim Songs (cxx.–cxxxvi.), prophetic or Messianic Psalms. But we cannot enter here into details, and refer to the full and able Introduction of MOLL's Commentary in this series.

Before we leave lyric poetry, we must say a few words on the LAMENTATIONS (קִינוֹת, *ϑρῆνοι, elegiæ*) of Jeremiah—the most extensive elegy in the Bible. They are a funeral dirge of the theocracy and the holy city after its destruction by Nebuchadnezzar and the Chaldees, and give most pathetic utterance to the most intense grief. The first lines strike the key-note. Jerusalem is personified and bewailed as a solitary widow:

(ALEPH)

How sitteth solitary
  The city once full of people!
She has become as a widow!
  She that was great among the nations,
A princess over the provinces,
  Has become subject to tribute.

---

* From ἒ ἒ λέγειν, to cry woe, woe! Comp. the German, *Klaglied*, *Trauerlied*, *Todtenlied*, *Grablied*.

† Thirty-seven in the first Book, Ps. iii.–xli., 18 in the second, 1 in the third, 2 in the fourth, 15 in the fifth Book. The Septuagint ascribes to David 85 Psalms (including xcix. and civ., which are probably his). The N. T. quotes as his also the anonymous Pss. ii. and xcv. (Acts iv. 25, 26; Hebr. iv. 7), and Ps. ii. certainly has the impress of his style and age (as Ewald admits). But some of the Psalms ascribed to him, either in the Hebrew or Greek Bible, betray by their Chaldaisms a later age. Hengstenberg and Alexander mostly follow the Jewish tradition; Delitzsch (*Commentar über die Psalmen*, p. 7) thinks that at least fifty may be defended as Davidic; while Hupfeld, Ewald, and especially Hitzig, considerably reduce the number. Ewald regards Ps. iii., iv., vii., viii., xi., xv., xviii., xix., xxiv., xxix., xxxii., ci., as undoubtedly Davidic; Ps. ii., xxiii., xxvii., lxii., lxiv., cx., cxxxviii., as coming very near to David.

‡ This Psalm is called *shir mismor* and *maschil*, and is ascribed both to the sons of Korah and to Heman the Ezrahite, of the age of Solomon (1 Kings v. 11). The older commentators generally regard the former as the singers of the *shir*, the latter as the author of the *maschil*. Hupfeld thinks that the title combines two conflicting traditions.

§ What the Germans would call *Kreuz- und Trost-Psalmen*.

(BETH) She weepeth bitterly in the night,
And her tears are upon her cheeks:
She hath no comforter
From among all her lovers:
All her friends have turned traitors to her,
They have become her enemies.

* * * * * * * * * * *

(LAMED) Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?
Behold and see,
If there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow,
Which is inflicted on me,
Wherewith Jehovah hath afflicted me
In the day of His fierce anger.

The ruin and desolation, the carnage and famine, the pollution of the temple, the desecration of the Sabbath, the massacre of the priests, the dragging of the chiefs into exile, and all the horrors and miseries of a long siege, contrasted with the remembrance of former glories and glad festivities, and intensified by the awful sense of Divine wrath, are drawn with life-like colors and form a picture of overwhelming calamity and sadness. "Every letter is written with a tear, every word is the sob of a broken heart!" Yet Jeremiah does not forget that the covenant of Jehovah with His people still stands. In the stormy sunset of the theocracy he beheld the dawn of a brighter day, and a new covenant written, not on tables of stone, but on the heart. The utterance of his grief, like the shedding of tears, was also a relief, and left his mind in a calmer and serener frame. Beginning with wailing and weeping, he ends with a question of hope, and with the prayer:

Turn us, O Jehovah, and we shall turn;
Renew our days of old!

These Lamentations have done their work very effectually, and are doing it still. They have soothed the weary years of the Babylonian Exile, and after the return they have kept up the lively remembrance of the deepest humiliation and the judgments of a righteous God. On the ninth day of the month of Ab (July) they are read year after year with fasting and weeping by that remarkable people who are still wandering in exile over the face of the earth, finding a grave in many lands, a home in none. Among Christians the poem is best appreciated in times of private affliction and public calamity; a companion in mourning, it serves also as a book of comfort and consolation.

The poetic structure of the Lamentations is the most artificial in the Bible. The first four chapters are alphabetically arranged, like the 119th and six other Psalms, and Proverbs xxxi. 10–31. Every stanza begins with a letter of the Hebrew alphabet in regular order; all the stanzas are nearly of the same length; each stanza has three nearly balanced clauses or members which together constitute one meaning; chaps. i., ii. and iv. contain twenty-two stanzas each, according to the number of Hebrew letters; the third chapter has three alphabetic series, making sixty-six stanzas in all. Dante chose the terza rima for his vision of hell, purgatory, and paradise; Petrarca the complicated sonnet for the tender and passionate language of love. The author of Lamentations may have chosen this structure as a discipline and check upon the intensity of his sorrow—perhaps also as a help to the memory. Poems of this kind, once learnt, are not easily forgotten.*

§ 8. DIDACTIC POETRY.

Didactic poetry is the combined product of imagination and reflection. It seeks to instruct as well as to please. It is not simply the outpouring of subjective feeling which carries in it its own end and reward, but aims at an object beyond itself. It is the connecting

* "In the scatterings and wanderings of families," says Isaac Taylor (p. 375), "and in lonely journeyings, in deserts and cities, where no synagogue-service could be enjoyed, the metrical Scriptures—infixed as they were in the memory, by the very means of these artificial devices of versets and of alphabetic order, and of alliteration—became food to the soul. Thus was the religious constancy of the people and its brave endurance of injury and insult sustained and animated."

link between pure poetry and philosophy. It supplies among the Shemitic nations the place of ethics, with this difference, that it omits the reasoning and argumentative process, and gives only the results of observation and reflection in a pleasing, mostly proverbial, sententious style, which sticks to the memory. It is laid down in the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. Many Psalms also are didactic (i., xix., xxxvii., cxix., *etc.*), and the Book of Job is a didactic drama (see below).

The palmy period of didactic or gnomic poetry is the peaceful and brilliant reign of Solomon, which lasted forty years (B. C. 1015–975). He was a favorite child of nature and grace. He occupies the same relation to the Proverbs as David to the Psalter, being the chief author and model for imitation. He was the philosopher, as David was the singer, of Israel. The fame of his wisdom was so great that no less than three thousand proverbs were ascribed to him. "God gave Solomon wisdom and understanding exceeding much, and largeness of heart, even as the sand that is on the sea-shore. And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east country, and all the wisdom of Egypt. For he was wiser than all men; than Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol: and his fame was in all nations round about. And he spake three thousand proverbs: and his songs were a thousand and five. And he spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall: he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes. And there came of all people to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all kings of the earth, which had heard of his wisdom" (1 Kings iv. 29–34). According to a rabbinical tradition, Aristotle derived his philosophy from the Solomonic writings which Alexander the Great sent him from Jerusalem.*

The usual word for a didactic poem is *mâshâl* (מָשָׁל, *παροιμία*, *παραβολή*), a likeness, similitude, comparison; then, in a wider sense, a short, sharp, pithy maxim, sententious saying, gnome, proverb couched in figurative, striking, pointed language. A proverb contains *multum in parvo*, and condenses the result of long observation and experience in a few words which strike the nail on the head and are easily remembered. It is the philosophy for the people, the wisdom of the street. The Orientals, especially the Arabs, are very fond of this kind of teaching. It suited their wants and limits of knowledge much better than an elaborate system of philosophy. And even now a witty or pithy proverb has more practical effect upon the common people than whole sermons and tracts.†

The PROVERBS of the Bible are far superior to any collection of the kind, such as the sayings of the Seven Wise Men of Greece, the Aurea Carmina attributed to Pythagoras, the Remains of the Poetæ Gnomici, the collections of Arabic proverbs. They bear the stamp of divine inspiration. They abound in polished and sparkling gems. They contain the practical wisdom (chokma) of Israel, and have furnished the richest contributions to the dictionary of proverbs among Christian nations. They trace wisdom to its true source, the fear of Jehovah (chap. i. 7). Nothing can be finer than the description of Wisdom in the eighth chapter, where she is personified as the eternal companion and delight of God, and commended beyond all earthly treasures:

Wisdom is better than rubies,
  And no precious things compare with her.

I, wisdom, dwell with prudence,
  And find out knowledge of wise counsels.

The fear of Jehovah is to hate evil;
  Pride, haughtiness, and an evil way,
  And a perverse mouth, do I hate.

Counsel is mine, and reflection;
  I am understanding; I have strength.

* Comp. on the wisdom of Solomon, Ewald's *Geschichte des Volkes Isroel*, Vol. III. pp. 374 sqq.; and Stanley's *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church*, Vol. II. pp. 252 sqq. Ewald exclaims with reference to the visit of the Queen of Sheba (p. 379): "*O glückliche Zeit wo mächtige Fürsten mitten in ihren von heiliger Gottesruhe umfriedigten Ländern so zu einander wallfahrten, so in Weisheit und was noch mehr ist, im regen Suchen derselben wetteifern können!*"

† Cicero says: "*Gravissimæ sunt ad beate vivendum breviter enunciatæ sententiæ.*"

By me kings reign,
  And princes decree justice.
By me princes rule,
  And nobles, all the judges of the earth.

I love them that love me;
  And they that seek me early shall find me.
Riches and honor are with me.
  Yea, enduring riches and righteousness.
My fruit is better than gold, yea, than refined gold;
  And my increase than choice silver.

I walk in the way of righteousness,
  In the midst of the path of rectitude;
To make, ensure abundance to those that love me,
  And to fill their storehouse.

* * * * * * * * * * *

Blessed is the man that heareth me,
  Watching daily at my gates,
  Waiting at the posts of my doors!
For whosoever findeth me findeth life;
  And shall obtain favor from Jehovah.

The description of the model Hebrew woman in her domestic and social relations (chap. xxxi. 10–31, in the acrostic form) has no parallel for truthfulness and beauty in all ancient literature, and forms the appropriate close of this book of practical wisdom; for from the family of which woman is the presiding genius, springs private and public virtue and national prosperity.

"The Book of Proverbs," says a distinguished modern writer, "is not on a level with the Prophets or the Psalms. It approaches human things and things divine from quite another side. It has even something of a worldly, prudential look, unlike the rest of the Bible. But this is the very reason why its recognition as a Sacred Book is so useful. It is the philosophy of practical life. It is the sign to us that the Bible does not despise common sense and discretion. It impresses upon us, in the most forcible manner, the value of intelligence and prudence, and of a good education. The whole strength of the Hebrew language, and of the sacred authority of the book is thrown upon these homely truths. It deals, too, in that refined, discriminating, careful view of the finer shades of human character, so often overlooked by theologians, but so necessary to any true estimate of human life. 'The heart knoweth its own bitterness, and the stranger does not intermeddle with its joy.' How much is there, in that single sentence, of consolation, of love, of forethought! And, above all, it insists, over and over again, upon the doctrine that goodness is '*wisdom*,' and that wickedness and vice are '*folly*.' There may be many other views of virtue and vice, of holiness and sin, better and higher than this. But there will always be some in the world who will need to remember that a good man is not only religious and just, but wise; and that a bad man is not only wicked and sinful, but a miserable, contemptible fool!" *

The poetic structure of the Proverbs is that of Hebrew parallelism in its various forms. They consist of single, double, triple, or more couplets; the members corresponding to each other in sense and diction, either synonymously or antithetically. Delitzsch calls them two-liners, four-liners, six-liners, eight-liners.† The first section, x.–xxii. 16, contains exclusively two-liners. Besides these there are a few three-liners, five-liners and seven-liners, where the odd line is either a repetition or a reason for the idea expressed in the first lines. A few specimens will make this clear.

---

* Stanley, Vol. II., p. 269. A different view is presented and elaborately defended in the commentary of Rev. John Miller, of Princeton (New York, 1872), who maintains that the Proverbs, being an inspired book, can have no secular, but must have throughout a spiritual, meaning. He charges King James' version with making the book "hopelessly secular in many places" (p. 12).

† *Zweizeiler, Vierzeiler, Sechszeiler, Achtzeiler. Commentary on Proverbs*, Leipz., 1873, pp. 8 sqq.

1. Single synonymous couplets:

Chap. iii. 1. My son, forget not my law:
And let thy heart keep my commandments.

12. Whom Jehovah loveth He correcteth:
Even as a father the son in whom he delighteth.

13. Blessed the man who finds wisdom:
And the man who obtains understanding.

xi. 25. The liberal soul shall be made fat:
And he that watereth shall himself be watered.

xvi. 32. He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty:
And he that ruleth his own spirit than he who taketh a city.

2. Single antithetic couplets:

Chap. x. 1. A wise son maketh a glad father:
But a foolish son is the grief of his mother.

12. Hatred stirreth up strifes:
But love covereth all sins.

16. The wages of the righteous is life:
The gain of the wicked is sin.

xiii. 9. The light of the righteous shall be joyous:
But the lamp of the wicked shall go out.

25. He that spareth his rod hates his son:
But he that loveth him giveth him timely chastisement.

xviii. 17. He that is first in his own cause seemeth right:
But his neighbor cometh and searcheth him.

3. Single couplets which merely express a comparison:

Chap. xxvii. 8. As a bird that wandereth from her nest,
So is a man that wandereth from his place.

15. A continual dropping in a very rainy day,
And a contentious woman are alike.

19. As in water face answereth to face,
So the heart of man to man.

4. Single couplets where the second member completes the idea of the first or assigns a reason or a qualification:

Chap. xvi. 24. Pleasant words are as a honey-comb,
Sweet to the soul and health to the bones.

31. The hoary head is a crown of glory,
If it be found in the way of righteousness.

5. Three-liners:

Chap. iii. 3. Let not mercy and truth forsake thee:
Bind them about thy neck;
(Synonymous) Write them upon the table of thine heart.

xxviii. 10. Whoso causeth the righteous to go astray in an evil way:
He shall fall himself into his own pit,
(Antithetic) But the upright shall inherit good things.

xxvii. 10. Thine own friend, and thy father's friend forsake not:
Neither go into thy brother's in the day of thy calamity;
(Reason) For better is a neighbor near than a brother afar off.

6. Double couplets or four-liners: xxiii. 15 sq.; xxiv. 3 sq., 28 sq.; xxx. 5 sq., 17 sq.; xxii. 22 sq., 24 sq.; xxv. 4 sq. These are all synonymous, or synthetic, or corroboratory, but there seems to be no example of an antithetic four-liner.

7. Five-liners; the last three usually explaining and confirming the idea of the first two lines: xxiii. 4 sq.; xxv. 6 sq.; xxx. 32 sq.

8. Triple couplets or six-liners, which spin out an idea with more or less repetition or confirmations and illustrations: xxiii. 1–3, 12–14, 19–21; xxiv. 11 sq.; xxx. 29–31.

9. Seven-liners: xxiii. 6–8. The only specimen in the Proverbs.

10. Quadruple couplets or eight-liners: xxiii. 22–25.

But these four, six, and eight-liners, so-called, may be easily resolved into two, three, or four single couplets. Take, *e. g.*, chap. xxiii. 12–14, which Delitzsch quotes as a six-liner, and we have there simply three couplets which carry out and unfold one idea, or expand the mashal sentence into a mashal poem:

> Apply thy heart to instruction:
> And thine ears to the words of knowledge.
> Withhold not correction from the child:
> For if thou beatest him with a rod, he shall not die.
> Thou shalt beat him with the rod,
> And shalt deliver his soul from hell.

ECCLESIASTES or KOHELETH is a philosophic poem, not in broken, disconnected maxims of wisdom, like the Proverbs, but in a series of soliloquies of a soul perplexed and bewildered by doubt, yet holding fast to fundamental truth, and looking from the vanities beneath the sun to the eternal realities above the sun. It is a most remarkable specimen of Hebrew scepticism subdued and moderated by Hebrew faith in God and His holy commandments, in the immortality of the soul, the judgment to come, the paramount value of true piety. It corresponds to the old age of Solomon, as the Song of Songs reflects the flowery spring of his youth, and the Proverbs the ripe wisdom of his manhood.* Whether written by the great monarch or not (which question is fully discussed on both sides in this Commentary), it personates him (i. 12) and gives the last sad results of his experience after a long life of unrivalled wisdom and unrivalled folly, namely, the overwhelming impression of the vanity of all things earthly, with the concluding lesson of the fear of God, which checks the tendency to despair, and is the star of hope in the darkness of midnight. The key-note is struck in the opening lines, repeated at the close (xii. 3):

> O vanity of vanities! Koheleth saith;
> O vanity of vanities! all—vanity!

This is the negative side. But the leading positive idea and aim is expressed in the concluding words:

> Fear God and keep His commandments,
> For this is all of man.

Some regard Koheleth as an ethical treatise in prose, with regular logical divisions. But it is full of poetic inspiration, and in part at least also poetic in form, with enough of rhythmical parallelism to awaken an emotional interest in these sad soliloquies and questionings of the poet. Prof. Tayler Lewis (in his additions to Zöckler's Commentary) has translated the poetic portions in Iambic measure, with occasional use of the Choriambus. We transscribe two specimens from chap. vii. and chap. xi.:

> Better the honored name than precious oil;
> Better the day of death than that of being born.

* This comparison was made by Rabbi Jonathan on the assumption of the Solomonic authorship of the three works.

Better to visit sorrow's house than seek the banquet hall;
Since that (reveals) the end of every man,
And he who lives should lay it well to heart.
Better is grief than mirth;
For in the sadness of the face the heart becometh fair.
The wise man's heart is in the house of mourning·
The fool's heart in the house of mirth.
Better to heed the chiding of the wise
Than hear the song of fools.
For like the sound of thorns beneath the pot,
So is the railing laughter of the fool.
This, too, is vanity.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Rejoice, O youth, in childhood; let thy heart
Still cheer thee in the day when thou art strong.
Go on in every way thy will shall choose,
And after every form thine eyes behold;
But know that for all this thy God will thee to judgment bring.
O, then, turn sorrow from thy soul, keep evil from thy flesh;
For childhood and the morn of life, they, too, are vanity.
Remember thy Creator, then, in the days when thou art young;
Before the evil days are come, before the years draw nigh;
When thou shalt say—delight in them is gone.

To didactic poetry belong also the FABLE and the PARABLE. Both are allegories in the style of history; both are conscious fictions for the purpose of instruction, and differ from the MYTH, which is the unconscious product of the religious imagination. But the fable rests on admitted impossibilities and introduces irrational creatures to teach maxims of secular prudence and lower, selfish morality; while the parable takes its illustrations from real life, human or animal, with its natural characteristics, and has a much higher moral and religious aim. It is, therefore, far better adapted, as a medium of instruction, to the true religion. "The fable seizes on that which man has in common with the creatures below him; the parable rests on the truth that man is made in the image of God." The former is only fitted for the instruction of youth, which does not raise the question of veracity; the latter is suited to all ages.

There are no fables in the New Testament, and only two in the Old, *viz.*, the fable of Jotham: the trees choosing their king, Judges ix. 8–15, and the fable of Jehoash: the cedars of Lebanon and the thistle, 2 Kings xiv. 9, and 2 Chr. xxv. 18. The riddle (parable) of Ezekiel xvii. 1–10 introduces two eagles as representatives of human characters, but without ascribing to them human attributes.

The parable occurs 2 Sam. xii. 1 (the poor man's ewe lamb), Isa. v. 1 (the vineyard yielding wild grapes), also 1 Kings xx. 39; xxii. 19 It was cultivated by Hillel, Shammai and other Jewish rabbis, and appears frequently in the Gemara and Midrash. It is found in its perfection in the Gospels. The parables of our Lord illustrate the various aspects of the kingdom of heaven (as those in the Synoptical Gospels), or the personal relation of Christ to His disciples (as the parable of the good shepherd, and that of the vine and the branches, in the Gospel of John). They conceal and reveal the profoundest ideas in the simplest and most lucid language. They are at once pure truth and pure poetry. Every trait is intrinsically possible and borrowed from nature and human life, and yet the composition of the whole is the product of the imagination. The art of illustrative teaching in parables never rose so high before or since, nor can it ever rise higher.*

§ 9. PROPHETIC POETRY.

This is peculiar to the Bible and to the religion of revelation. Heathen nations had their divinations and oracles, but no divinely inspired prophecy. Man may have forebodings

* Ewald (p. 54) says of the parables of Christ: "*Was hier aus der Menschenwelt erzählt wird, ist vollkommen wahr, d. i. den menschlichen Verhältnissen vollkommen entsprechend, sodass keiner der es hört an seinem Dasein zweifeln kann, und ist dennoch nur Bild, nur Lehre, und nicht anders gemeint. Aber mit der höchsten Wahrheit der Schilderung dieses menschlichen Lebens verbindet sich hier ihre höchste Einfalt, Lieblichkeit und Vollendung, um ihr den unwiderstehlichsten Zauber zu geben.*"

of the future, and may conjecture what may come to pass under certain conditions; but God only knows the future, and he to whom He chooses to reveal it.

Prophecy is closely allied to poetry. The prophet sees the future as a picture with the spiritual eye enlightened by the Divine mind, and describes it mostly in more or less poetic form. Prophetic poetry combines a didactic and an epic element.* It rouses the conscience, enforces the law of God, and holds up the history of the future, the approaching judgments and mercies of God for instruction, reproof, comfort and encouragement. Prophecy is too elevated to descend to ordinary prose, and yet too practical to bind itself to strict rules. Ezekiel and Daniel, like St. John in the Apocalypse, use prose, but a prose that has all the effect of poetry. The other prophets employ prose in the narrative and introductory sections, but a rhythmical flow of diction in the prophecies proper, with divisions of clauses and stanzas, and rise often to the highest majesty and power. The sublime prayer of Habakkuk (ch. iii.) is a lyric poem and might as well have a place in the Psalter.

The greatest poet among the prophets is Isaiah. He gathers up all the past prophecies to send them enriched into the future, and combines the deepest prophetic inspiration with the sublimest and sweetest poetry.†

The earliest specimens of prophetic poetry are the prediction of Noah, Gen. ix. 25–27, the blessing of Jacob, Gen. xlix., the prophecies of Balaam, Numb. xxiv., and the farewell blessing of the twelve tribes by Moses, Deut. xxxiii. The golden age of prophetic poetry began with the decline of lyric poetry, and continued till the extinction of prophecy, warning the people of the approaching judgments of Jehovah, and comforting them in the midst of their calamities with His promise of a brighter future when the Messiah shall come to redeem His people and to bless all the nations of the earth.

We select one of the oldest specimens, a part of the remarkable prophecy of Balaam concerning Israel, which has a melodious lyrical flow (Num. xxiv. 4–10, 17–19):

He saith who heareth the words of God,
Who seeth the vision of the Almighty,
Falling down, and having his eyes opened:

How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob,
  Thy tabernacles, O Israel!
As the valleys are they spread forth,
  As gardens by the river side,
As lign aloes which the Lord hath planted,
  As cedar trees beside the waters.

He shall flow with water from his buckets,
  And his seed shall be in many waters,
And his king shall be higher than Agag,
  And his kingdom shall be exalted.
God bringeth him forth out of Egypt;
  He hath as it were the strength of a buffalo:
He shall eat up the nations his enemies,
  And shall break their bones in pieces,
  And smite them through with his arrows.

He couched, he lay down as a lion,
  And as a lioness; who shall stir him up?
Blessed is he that blesseth thee,
  And cursed is he that curseth thee.

* * * * * * * *

* Ewald treats prophecy as a part of didactic poetry. "*Ein reiner Dichter,*" he says (p. 51), "*im ursprünglichsten Sinne des Wortes ist der Prophet nicht: was er ausspricht, soll von vorne an bestimmend, vorschreibend, belehrend auf Andere wirken. Aber sein Wort will von der Begeisterung Flügeln getragen von oben herab treffen, und muss so von vorn an erhaben in gleicher Höhe sich bis zum Ende halten. . . . So drängt sich denn dem Propheten die längst gegebene Dichterweise unwillkührlich auf, ähnlich hebt und senkt sich bei ihm der Strom der Rede, nur der Gesang fällt vor der ungewöhnlichen Höhe und dem Ernste seiner Worte leicht von selbst weg.*"

† Comp. the eloquent description of Isaiah by Ewald in his *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes*, Stuttg. 1840, vol. I., p. 166.

There shall come forth a Star out of Jacob,
And a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel
And shall smite through the corners of Moab,
And break down all the sons of tumult.
And Edom shall be a possession,
And Seir shall be a possession, his enemies;
While Israel doeth valiantly.
And out of Jacob shall he have dominion,
And shall destroy the remnant from the city.

The nearest approach which the prophecy of the Old Testament several hundred years before Christ made to the very heart of the gospel salvation, is in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah:

Who hath believed our report?
And to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?
For He shall grow up before Him as a tender plant,
And as a root out of a dry ground:
He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see Him,
There is no beauty that we should desire Him.
He is despised and rejected by men;
A Man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief:
And we hid as it were our faces from Him,
He was despised and we esteemed Him not.

Surely He hath borne our griefs,
And carried our sorrows:
Yet we did esteem Him stricken,
Smitten of God and afflicted.
But He was wounded for our transgressions,
He was bruised for our iniquities.
The chastisement of our peace *was* upon Him;
And with His stripes we are healed.
All we like sheep have gone astray;
We have turned every one to his own way;
And the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all.

He was oppressed, and He was afflicted,
Yet He opened not His mouth:
He is brought as a Lamb to the slaughter,
And as a sheep before her shearers is dumb,
So He openeth not His mouth.
He was taken from prison and from judgment:
And who shall declare his generation?
For He was cut off out of the land of the living:
For the transgression of my people was He stricken.
And He made His grave with the wicked,
And with the rich in His death;
Because He had done no violence,
Neither was any deceit in His mouth:
Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him;
He hath put Him to grief.

When Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin,
He shall see His seed. He shall prolong His days,
And the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand.
He shall see the travail of *His* soul, *and* be satisfied.
By His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many;
For He shall bear their iniquities.
Therefore will I divide Him, a portion with the great,
And He shall divide the spoil with the strong;
Because He hath poured out His soul unto death:
And He was numbered with the transgressors;
And He bare the sin of many,
And made intercession for the transgressors.

§ 10. DRAMATIC POETRY.

If we start with the Greek conception of the drama, there is none in the Bible. But if we take the word in a wider sense, and apply it to lengthy poetic compositions, unfolding an

action and introducing a number of speakers or actors, we have two dramas in the Old Testament. The Song of Solomon is a lyric drama or melo-drama; the Book of Job, a didactic drama.

The best judges of different ages and churches, as Gregory of Nazianzen, Bossuet, Lowth, Ewald, Renan, Stanley, recognize the dramatic element in these two poems, and some have even gone so far as to suppose that both, or at least the Canticles, were really intended for the stage.* But there is not the slightest trace of a theatre in the history of Israel before the age of Herod, who introduced foreign customs; as there is none at the present day in the Holy Land, and scarcely among the Mohammedan Arabs, unless we regard the single reciters of romances (always men or boys) with their changing voice and gestures as dramatic actors. The modern attempts to introduce theatres in Beirut and Algeria have signally failed.

1. The CANTICLES presents the Hebrew ideal of pure bridal and conjugal love in a series of monologues and dialogues by different persons: a lover, king Solomon (Shelomoh, the Peaceful), a maiden named Shulamith, and a chorus of virgins, daughters of Jerusalem. There are no breaks or titles to indicate the change of scene or speakers, and they can be recognized only from the sense and the change of gender and number in the personal pronoun. The English version is much obscured by a neglect of the distinction of feminine and masculine pronouns in the Hebrew.

The poem is full of the fragrance of spring, the beauty of flowers, and the loveliness of love. How sweet and charming is Solomon's description of spring, ch. ii. 10-14, which a German poet calls "a kiss of heaven to earth."

Rise up, my love, my fair one, and go forth!
For, lo, the winter is past,
The rain is over, is gone.
The flowers appear on the earth,
The time for the singing of birds is come,
And the voice of the turtle is heard in our land.
The fig-tree spices its green figs,
And the vines with tender blossoms give fragrance.

Arise, my love, my fair one, and go forth!
My dove, in the clefts of the rock,
In the recess of the cliffs,
Let me see thy countenance,
Let me hear thy voice;
For thy voice is sweet,
And thy countenance is comely.

The Song of Solomon canonizes the love of nature, and the love of sex, as the Book of Esther (where the name of God never occurs) canonizes patriotism or the love of country. It gives a place in the Book of God to the noblest and strongest passion which the Creator has planted in man, before the fall, and which reflects His own infinite love to His creatures, and the love of Christ to His Church. *Procul abeste profani!* The very depth of perversion to which the passion of love can be degraded, only reveals the height of its origin and destiny. Love in its primal purity is a "blaze" or "lightning flash from Jehovah" (Shalhebeth-Jah, ch. viii. 6), and stronger than death, and as it proceeds from God so it returns to Him; for "God is love; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him" (1 John iv. 16).†

* Ewald (*Die Dichter des A. B.*, I. 72 sqq.) asserts very positively, but without proof, that dramas were enacted on the great festivals, and at the courts of David and Solomon. He calls the Canticles "the purest model of a comedy (*Lustspiel*)"; Job, "a genuine tragedy (*Trauerspiel*)." He admits, however, that in no case could God (who is one of the actors in Job) have been introduced on a Jewish stage, like the gods in the Greek dramas. Renan (*Le Cantique des Cantiques*) denies the existence of public theatres among the Hebrews, owing to the absence of a complicated mythology which stimulated the development of the drama among the Hindoos and Greeks, but maintains that the Song of Songs, being a dramatic poem, must have been represented in private families at marriage feasts.

† That most pure and godly German hymnist Tersteegen, in his sweet hymn: "*Ich bete an die Macht der Liebe*," traces all true love to Christ as the fountain-head, in these beautiful lines:

Ehr' sei dem hohen Jesusnamen,
In dem der Liebe Quell entspringt,
Von dem hier alle Bächlein kamen,
Aus dem der Sel'gen Schaar dort trinkt.

As to the artistic arrangement or the number of acts and cantos in each act of this melodrama of Love there is considerable difference among commentators. Some divide it into five acts, according to the usual arrangement of dramas (Ewald, Böttcher, Zöckler, Moody Stuart, Davidson, Ginsburg), some into six (Delitzsch, Hahn), some into seven, corresponding to the seven days of the Jewish marriage festival for which the successive portions of the poem are supposed to have been intended to be sung (Bossuet, Percy, Williams). Ewald subdivides the five acts into thirteen, Renan into sixteen, others into more or less cantos. On the other hand Thrupp and Green give up the idea of a formal artistic construction, such as the Indo-European conception of a drama would require, and substitute for it a looser method of arrangement or aggregation with abrupt transitions and sudden changes of scene. All the parts are variations of the same theme, "the love of king Solomon and his bride, the image of a divine and spiritual love." Those who regard the poem as an idyl rather than a drama (Sir William Jones, Good, Fry, Noyes, Herbst, Heiligstedt) divide it into a series of songs, but likewise differ as to the number and the pauses.

This is not the place to enter into the wilderness of interpretations of this wonderful and much abused Song, which are fully discussed in this Commentary by Drs. Zöckler and Green. But I must protest against the profane, or exclusively erotic interpretation which in various contradictory shapes has of late become so fashionable among scholars, and which makes the position of this book in the canon an inexplicable enigma. I add the judicious remarks of Dr. Angus on the subject.* "Much of the language of this poem has been misunderstood by early expositors. Some have erred by adopting a fanciful method of explanation, and attempting to give a mystical meaning to every minute circumstance of the allegory. In all figurative representations there is always much that is mere costume. It is the general truth only that is to be examined and explained. Others, not understanding the spirit and luxuriancy of eastern poetry, have considered particular passages as defective in delicacy, an impression which the English version has needlessly confirmed, and so have objected to the whole, though the objection does not apply with greater force to this book than to Hesiod and Homer, or even to some of the purest of our own authors. If it be remembered, that the figure employed in this allegory is one of the most frequent in Scripture, that in extant oriental poems it is constantly employed to express religious feeling, that many expressions which are applied in our translation to the person, belong properly to the dress, that every generation has its own notions of delicacy (the most delicate in this *sense* being by no means the most virtuous), that nothing is described but chaste affection, that Shulamith speaks and is spoken of collectively, and that it is the general truth only which is to be allegorized, the whole will appear to be no unfit representation of the union between Christ and true believers in every age. Properly understood, this portion of Scripture will minister to our holiness. It may be added, however, that it was the practice of the Jews to withhold the book from their children till their judgments were matured." The most recent commentator, too, justly remarks:† "Shall we then regard it as a mere fancy, which for so many ages past has been wont to find in the pictures and melodies of the Song of Songs types and echoes of the actings and emotions of the highest Love, of Love Divine, in its relations to Humanity; which, if dimly discerned through their aid by the Synagogue, have been amply revealed in the gospel to the Church? Shall we not still claim to trace in the noble and gentle history thus presented foreshadowings of the infinite condescensions of Incarnate Love?—that Love which, first stooping in human form to visit us in our low estate in order to seek out and win its object (Ps. cxxxvi. 23), and then raising along with itself a sanctified Humanity to the Heavenly Places (Eph. ii. 6), is finally awaiting there an invitation from the mystic Bride, to return to earth once more and seal the union for eternity (Rev. xxii. 17)?"

2. The Book of Job is a didactic drama, with an epic introduction and close. The prologue (chs. i. and ii.) and the epilogue (ch xlii. 7-17) are written in plain prose, the body of the poem in poetry. It has been called the *Hebrew tragedy*, but differing from other trage-

* *Bible Handbook*, Lond. ed., p. 449.

† Kingsbury, in the "Speaker's Commentary" (vol. IV., p. 673).

dies by its happy termination. We better call it a *dramatic theodicy*. It wrestles with the perplexing problem of ages, *viz.*, the true meaning and object of evil and suffering in the world under the government of a holy, wise and merciful God. The dramatic form shows itself in the symmetrical arrangement, the introduction of several speakers, the action, or rather the suffering of the hero, the growing passion and conflict, the secret crime supposed to underlie his misfortune, and the awful mystery in the background. But there is little external action (δρᾶμα) in it, and this is almost confined to the prologue and epilogue. Instead of it we have here an intellectual battle of the deepest moral import, mind grappling with mind on the most serious problems which can challenge our attention. The outward drapery only is dramatic, the soul and substance of the poem is didactic, with all the Hebrew ideas of Divine Providence, which differ from the Greek notion of blind Fate as the light of day differs from midnight. It is intended for the study, not for the stage.*

The book opens, like a Greek drama, with a prologue, which introduces the reader into the situation, and makes him acquainted with the character, the prosperous condition, the terrible misfortunes, and the exemplary patience of the hero. Even God, and His great antagonist, Satan, who appears, however, in heaven as a servant of God, are drawn into the scenery, and a previous arrangement in the Divine counsel precedes and determines the subsequent transaction. History on earth is thus viewed as an execution of the decrees of heaven, and as controlled throughout by supernatural forces. But we have here the unsearchable wisdom of the Almighty Maker and Ruler of men, not the dark impersonal Fate of the heathen tragedy. This grand feature of Job has been admirably imitated by Göthe in the prologue of his Faust.

The action itself commences after seven days and seven nights of most eloquent silence. The grief over the misfortunes which, like a succession of whirlwinds, had suddenly hurled the patriarchal prince from the summit of prosperity to the lowest depths of misery, culminating in the most loathsome disease, and intensified by the heartless sneers of his wife, at last bursts forth in a passionate monologue of Job, cursing the day of his birth. Then follows the metaphysical conflict with his friends, Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar, who now turn to enemies, and "miserable comforters," "forgers of lies, and botchers of vanities." The debate has three acts, with an increasing entanglement, and every act consists of three assaults of the false friends, and as many defences of Job (with the exception that in the third and last battle Zophar retires and Job alone speaks).† The poem reaches its height in the triumphant assertion of faith in his Redeemer (ch. xix. 25-27), by which "the patriarch of Uz rises to a level with the patriarch of Ur as a pattern of faith."‡ After a closing monologue of Job, expressing fully his feelings and thoughts in view of the past controversy, the youthful Elihu, who had silently listened, comes forward, and in three speeches administered deserved rebuke to both parties, with as little mercy for Job as for his friends, but with a better philosophy of suffering, whose object he represents to be correction and reformation, the reproof of arrogance and the exercise of humility and faith. He begins the disentanglement of the problem and makes the transition to the final decision. At last God Himself, to whom Job had appealed, appears as the Judge of the controversy, and Job humbly submits to His infinite power and wisdom, and penitently confesses his sin and folly. This is the internal solution of the mighty problem, if solution it can be called.

A brief epilogue relates the historical issue, the restoration and increased prosperity of Job after this severest trial of his faith, and patient submission to God.

To the external order corresponds the internal dialectic development in the warlike motion of conflicting sentiments and growing passions. The first act of the debate shows yet a

* W. A. Wright (in W. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, III. 2553) says of the Book of Job: "Inasmuch as it represents an action and a progress, it is a drama as truly and really as any poem can be which develops the working of passion and the alternations of faith, hope, distrust, triumphant confidence, and black despair, in the struggle which it depicts the human mind as engaged in, while attempting to solve one of the most intricate problems it can be called upon to regard. It is a drama as life is a drama, the most powerful of all tragedies; but that it is a dramatic poem intended to be represented upon the stage, or capable of being so represented, may be confidently denied."

† The significance of the ruling number three reminds one of the trilogies in Dante's *Divina Comedia*.

‡ See a fine exposition of this passage in Dr. Green's *Argument of the Book of Job Unfolded*, New York, 1874, pp. 181 sqq.

tolerable amount of friendly feeling on both sides. In the second the passion is much increased, and the charges of the opponents against Job made severer. In the last debate Eliphaz, the leader of the rest, proceeds to the open accusation of heavy crimes against the sufferer with an admonition to repent and to convert himself to God. Job, after repeated declarations of his innocence and vain attempts at convincing his opponents, appeals at last to God as his Judge. God appears, convinces him, by several questions on the mysteries of nature, of his ignorance, and brings him to complete submission under the infinite power and wisdom of the Almighty, chap. xlii. 2–6.

> I know that Thou canst do all things;
> And no thought can be withheld from Thee.
> Who is this that hideth counsel without knowledge?
> I have then uttered what I understand not.
> But hear me now, and let me speak;
> Thee will I ask, and do Thou teach me.
> I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear;
> But now mine eyes behold Thee.
> Therefore I abhor it (I recant),*
> And repent in dust and ashes.

The Book of Job, considering its antiquity and artistic perfection, rises like a pyramid in the history of literature, without a predecessor and without a rival.

§ 11. POETIC DICTION.

The language of Hebrew as well as of all other poetry, is, in one respect, more free, in other respects more bound, than the language of prose. It is the language of imagination and feeling, as distinct from the language of sober reflection and judgment. It is controlled by the idea of beauty and harmony. It is the speech of the Sabbath-day. It soars above what is ordinary and common. It is vivid, copious, elevated, sonorous, striking, impressive. To this end the poet has more license than the prose-writer; while, on the other hand, it imposes on him certain restraints of versification to secure greater æsthetic effect. He is permitted to use words which are uncommon or obsolete, but which, for this very reason, strike the attention and excite the emotion. He may also use ordinary words in an extraordinary sense. The licenses of the Hebrew poets are found in the following particulars:

1. Archaic forms and peculiar words, some of Aramaic or even a prior Shemitic dialect: *Eloah* for *Elohim* (God), *enosh* for *adam* (man), *orach* for *derech* (path), *havah* for *haiah* (to be), *millah* for *dabar* (word), *paal* for *asah* (to do), *katal* for *razah* (to kill). Sometimes they are accumulated for poetic effect.†

2. Common words in an uncommon sense: *Joseph* for the nation of Israel; adjectives for substantive objects, as '*the hot*' for the sun, '*the white*' for the moon (Cant. vi. 10), '*the strong*' for a bull (Ps. l. 13), '*the flowing*' for streams (Isa. xliv. 3).

3. Peculiar grammatical forms, or additional syllables, which give the word more sound and harmony, or an air of antiquity; as the paragogic *ah* (ָה) affixed to nouns in the absolute state, *o* (וֹ-), and *i* (ִי-) affixed to nouns in the construct state; the feminine termination *ath* (for the ordinary *ah*); the plural ending *in* and *ai* (for *im*); the verbal suffixes *mo*, *amo*, and *emo*; the pronominal suffixes to nouns and prepositions—*amo* (for *am*), and *ehu* (for *an*); also lengthened vowel forms of pronouns and prepositions—*lamo* (for *lo* or *lahem*), *lemo* (for לְ), *bemo* (for בְּ), *kemo* (for כְּ), *eleh* (for אֶל), *adai* (for עַד).

* אֶמְאַס (from מאס to reject, to despise, to abhor), without the pronominal object, which is either the person of Job (Sept. ἐμαυτόν; Vulg. *me*; E. V., *myself*; Luther, *mich*), or his argument, his foolish wisdom (Aben Ezra: *quicquid antea in te sum temere loquutus et imperite*). Ewald translates indefinitely: *Drum widerrufe ich und übe Reue*; Similarly Zöckler: *Darum widerrufe ich und thue Busse.*

† So in the highly poetic Ps. viii. 8 we have *zoneh* (sheep) for the prosaic צֹאן, *alaphim* (oxen) for בָּקָר, *sadai* (field) for שָׂדֶה, and *bahamoth sadai* (beasts of the field) instead of חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ.

§ 12. VERSIFICATION. PARALLELISM OF MEMBERS.

Hebrew poetry has a certain rhythmical flow, a rise and fall (*arsis* and *thesis*), versicular and strophic divisions, also occasional alliterations and rhymes, and especially a correspondence of clauses called parallelism, but no regular system of versification, as we understand it. It is not fettered by mechanical and uniform laws, it does not rest on quantity or syllabic measure, there is no equal number of syllables in each line or verse, nor of lines in each stanza or strophe. It is a poetry of sense rather than sound, and the thought is lord over the outward form. It differs in this respect from classical, modern, and also from later Hebrew poetry.*

This freedom and elasticity of Hebrew poetry gives it, for purposes of translation, a great advantage above ancient and modern poetry, and subserves the universal mission of the Bible, as the book of faith and spiritual life for all nations and in all languages. A more artificial and symmetrical structure would make a translation a most difficult task, and either render it dull and prosy, by a faithful adherence to the sense, or too free and loose, by an imitation of the artistic form. Besides it would introduce confusion among the translations of different Christian nations. The Iliad of Homer, the Odes of Horace, Dante's Divina Comedia, Petrarca's Sonnets, Milton's Paradise Lost, Göthe's Faust, could not be translated in prose without losing their poetic charm, yea, their very soul. They must be freely reproduced in poetic form, and this can only be done by a poetic genius, and with more or less departure from the original. But the Psalms, the Book of Job, and Isaiah can be transferred by a good and devout scholar, in form as well as in substance, into any language, without sacrificing their beauty, sublimity, force, and rhythm. The Latin, English, and German Psalters are as poetic as the Hebrew, and yet agree with it and among themselves. It is impossible not to see here the hand of Providence, which made the word of truth accessible to all.

The few acrostic or alphabetical poems can hardly be called an exception, *viz.*, Pss. xxv., xxxiv., xxxvii., cxi., cxii., cxix. and cxlv., the Lamentations, and the last chapter of Proverbs (xxxi. 10 sqq.). For the alphabetical order is purely external and mechanical, and at best only an aid to the memory. Pss. cxi. and cxii. are the simplest examples of this class; each contains twenty-two lines, according to the number of the Hebrew alphabet, and the successive lines begin with the letters in their regular order. Ps. cxix. consists of twenty-two strophes, corresponding to the number of Hebrew letters; each strophe begins with the letter of the alphabet, and has eight parallelisms of two lines each, and the first line of each parallelism begins with the initial letter of the strophe. The remaining four acrostic Psalms are not so perfect in arrangement.

Many attempts have been made by Jewish and Christian scholars to reduce the form of Hebrew poetry to a regular system, but they have failed. Josephus says that the Song of Moses at the Red Sea was composed in the hexameter measure, and the Psalms in trimeters, pentameters and other metres. But he and Philo were anxious to show that the poets of their nation anticipated the Greek poets even in the art of versification. Jerome, the most learned among the Fathers (appealing to Philo, Josephus, Origen, and Eusebius for proof), asserts that the Psalter, the Lamentations, Job and almost all the poems of the Bible are composed in hexameters and pentameters, with dactyls and spondees, or in other regular metres, like the classic poems, and points also to the alphabetical arrangement of Pss. cxi., cxii., cxix., cxlv., and the Lamentations. Among later scholars some deny all metrical laws in Hebrew poetry (Joseph Scaliger, Richard Simon); others maintain the rhythm with-

* Delitzsch (*Com. on the Psalms*, Leipz., 1867, p. 17) says: "*Die althebräische Poesie hat weder Reim noch Metrum, welche beide erst im 7 Jahr. n. Chr. von der jud. Poesie angeeignet wurden.*" But afterwards he qualifies this remark and admits that the beginnings of rhyme and metre are found in the poetry of the O. T., so that there is an element of truth in the assertion of Philo, Josephus, Eusebius and Jerome, who find there the Greek and Roman metres. Ewald (l. c., p. 104) denies the existence of rhyme in Hebrew poetry; yet the occasional rhymes and alliterations in the song of Lamech, the song of Moses, the song of Deborah, *etc.*, can hardly be merely accidental.

out metre* (Gerhard Vossius); others both rhythm and metre (Gomarus, Buxtorf, Hottinger); others a full system of versification, though differing much in detail (Meibomius, Hare, Anton, Lautwein, Bellermann); while still others, believing in the existence of such a system, in whole or in part, think it impossible to recover it (Carpzov, Lowth, Jahn, to some extent also Herder and Wright). Ewald discusses at great length the Hebrew rhythm, verses and strophes, also Hebrew song and music, without making the matter very clear. Merx finds in the Book of Job a regular syllabic and strophic structure, eight syllables in each stich or line, and an equal number of stichs in each strophe, but he is obliged to resort to arbitrary conjectures of lacunæ or interpolations in the masoretic text.

The conceded and most marked feature of Bible poetry is the *parallelism of members*, so-called.† It consists in a certain rhythmical and musical correspondence of two or more sentences of similar or opposite meaning, and serves by a felicitious variation to give full expression and harmony to the thought. The parallel members complete or illustrate each other, and produce a music of vowels and consonants. Paralellism reflects the play of human feeling, and supplies the place of regular metre and rhyme in a way that is easily understood and remembered, and can be easily reproduced in every language. Ewald happily compares it to "the rapid stroke as of alternate wings," and "the heaving and sinking as of the troubled heart."

There are different forms of parallelism, according to the nature of the internal relation of the members. The correspondence may be either one of harmony, or one of contrast, or one of progressive thought, or one simply of comparison, or of symmetrical structure. Since Lowth, it has become customary to distinguish three classes of parallelisms: *synonymous*, *antithetic*, and *synthetic* or *constructive*. The majority belong to the third class, and even those which are usually counted as synonymous, show more or less progress of thought, and might as well be assigned to the third class. A large number of parallelisms cannot be brought under either class.

1. SYNONYMOUS parallelism expresses the same idea in different but equivalent words, as in the following examples:

Ps. VIII. 4. What is man that Thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man that Thou visitest him?

Ps. XIX. 1, 2. The heavens declare the glory of God:
And the firmament showeth His handiwork.

Day unto day uttereth speech:
And night unto night proclaimeth knowledge.

Ps. CIII. 1. Bless the Lord, O my soul:
And all that is within me, bless His holy name.

These are parallel couplets; but there are also parallel triplets, as in Ps. i. 1:

Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly:
Nor standeth in the way of sinners,
Nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.

Similar triplets occur in Job iii. 4, 6, 9; Isa. ix. 20.

Parallel quatrains are less frequent, as in Ps. ciii. 11, 12, where the first member corresponds to the third, and the second to the fourth:

* All metre is rhythm, but not all rhythm is metre, as Augustine says (*De musica*).

† Lowth is the author of a more fully developed system of parallelism and its various forms. But the thing itself was known before under different names. Aben Ezra calls it *duplicatio* (כָּפוּל), Kimchi: *duplicatio sententiæ verbis variatis.* See Delitzsch, l. c. p. 18. Rabbi Azariah, and especially Schöttgen (*Horæ Hebraicæ*, Vol. I. 1249–1263), as quoted by Prof. Wright (*Smith's Dict. of the Bible*, III. 2557), seem to have anticipated the main features of Lowth's system. Parallelism is also found among other Shemitic nations, in Old Egyptian poetry, and among the Chinese.

For as the heavens are high above the earth,
So great is His mercy towards them that fear Him.
So far as the East is from the West,
So far has He removed our transgressions from Him.

When the two members are precisely the same in word and sense, they are called *identic* parallelism; but there are no cases of mere repetition, unless it be for the sake of emphasis, as in Isa. xv. 1; Ps. xciv. 1, 3.

2. ANTITHETIC parallelism expresses a contrast or antithesis in sentiment:

PS. I. 6. For the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous:
But the way of the ungodly shall perish.

PS. XXXVII. 9. Evil-doers shall be cut off:
But those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth.

PROV. X. 7. The memory of the just is a blessing;
But the name of the wicked shall rot.

PROV. XII. 10. A righteous man regardeth the life of his beast,
But the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel.

HOS. XIV. 9. The ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them;
But the transgressors shall fall therein.

3. SYNTHETIC or CONSTRUCTIVE parallelism. Here the construction is similar in form, without a precise correspondence in sentiment and word as equivalent or opposite, but with a gradation or progress of thought, as in Ps. xix. 7-11; cxlviii. 7-13; Isa. xiv. 4-9. We quote the first:

The law of Jehovah is perfect, converting the soul:
The testimony of Jehovah is sure, making wise the simple.
The statutes of Jehovah are right, rejoicing the heart:
The commandment of Jehovah is pure, enlightening the eyes.
The fear of Jehovah is clean, enduring forever:
The judgments of Jehovah are truth, they are righteous altogether.
More to be desired are they than gold, and much fine gold:
And sweeter than honey, and the honey comb.
Moreover, by them is thy servant warned:
In keeping of them there is great reward.

To these three kinds of parallelism Jebb (*Sacred Literature*) adds a fourth, which he calls *introverted* parallelism, where the first line corresponds to the last (fourth), and the second to the penultimate (third), as in Prov. xxiii. 15, 16. De Wette distinguishes four, slightly differing from Lowth, Delitzsch six or eight forms of parallelism, as we have already seen in the remarks on the Proverbs.

The pause in the progress of thought determines the division of lines and verses. Hebrew poetry always adapts the poetic structure to the sense. Hence there is no monotony, but a beautiful variety and alternation of different forms. Sometimes the parallelism consists simply in the *rhythmical correspondence* of sentences or clauses, without repetition or contrast, or in carrying forward a line of thought in sentences of nearly equal length, as in Psalm cxv. 1–8.

Not unto us, Jehovah, not unto us,
But unto Thy name give glory,
For Thy mercy,
For Thy truth's sake.
Wherefore should the heathen say,
"Where is now their God?"
But our God is in the heavens;
All that He pleased He has done.
Their idols are silver and gold,
The work of the hands of men.
A mouth have they, but they speak not;
Eyes have they, but they see not;

Ears have they, but they hear not;
Noses have they, but they smell not;
Hands have they, but they handle not;
Feet have they, but they walk not;
They make no sound in their throat.
Like them are they that made them,
All that trust in them.

This looser kind of parallelism or rhythmical correspondence and symmetrical construction of sentences, characterizes also much of the Hebrew prose, and is continued in the New Testament, *e. g.*, in the Sermon on the Mount (especially the Beatitudes), in the Prologue of John, in Rom. v. 12 sqq.; viii. 28 sqq.; 2 Cor. xiii. 1 sqq.; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Tim. ii. 11, and other passages which we are accustomed to read as prose, but which even in form are equal to the best poetry—gems in beautiful setting, apples of gold in pictures of silver.

A NEW

RHYTHMICAL VERSION

OF

THE BOOK OF JOB.

WITH EXEGETICAL NOTES AND ADDENDA CONTAINING EXCURSUS ON DIFFICULT AND IMPORTANT PASSAGES.

BY TAYLER LEWIS.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
743–745 BROADWAY.

THEISM

OF

THE BOOK OF JOB.

ITS GRANDEUR AND PURITY.

Among all writings, inspired or uninspired, the Book of Job stands preëminent for its lofty representations of the pure moral personality, the holiness, the unchallengeable justice, the wisdom, the Omnipotence, the absolute Sovereignty of God. Whatever may be said of its obscurities and difficulties in other respects, in the splendor of its theism it is unsurpassed. Whether we take the earlier or the later date that has been assigned to it, the wonder is still the same. "Crude theistic conceptions" have been charged upon the whole Old Testament, surpassing, in some respects, those of surrounding nations, yet still characteristic of the infancy of the race and the infancy of science. The Book of Job refutes this. Our best modern theology, in its most approved and philosophical symbols, may be challenged to produce any thing surpassing the representations which this ancient writing gives us of God as "a Spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable in His being, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth." Nothing approaches its ideal of the ineffable purity of the divine character, before which the heavens veil their brightness, and the loftiest intelligences are represented as comparatively unholy and impure. God the Absolute, the Infinite, the Unconditioned, the Unknowable,—these are the terms by which our most pretentious philosophizing would characterize Deity as something altogether beyond the ordinary theological conception. But even here this old Book of Job surpasses them in setting forth the transcending glory, the ineffable height, the measureless profundity of the Eternal. How much stronger the intellectual and moral impression of this, as derived from the vivid metaphors of Zophar, than any thing that comes to us from the negatives of Sir William Hamilton, or from any such powerless abstractions as philosophy is compelled to employ: "Canst thou explore the deep things of God? Canst thou find out the Almighty in His perfection? Higher than Heaven, what canst thou do? Deeper than Hades, what canst thou know? Longer than the earth; broader than the sea;" excelling all height, going beneath all depth, extending beyond all space; infinite in its unsearchableness, yet never dissociated from the idea of a personal Divine presence more wondrous in its nearness than in any conception we can form of its immensity.

CONTRAST BETWEEN THIS EXALTED THEISM AND THE DIM ACCOMPANYING VIEW OF A FUTURE LIFE.

In connection with such a sublime theism, there is to be noted another fact, worthy of attention in itself, but more especially in its bearing on the first and greater aspect of the Book. This exalted idea of God is almost wholly separated from any dogmatic view of a future life for man, although it most distinctly recognizes what has ever been regarded as having

a close connection with this latter doctrine, namely, a spiritual world inhabited by superhuman beings, good and bad, among whom a conspicuous place is held by those who are called בני אלהים, or "Sons of God." The idea of another side of human existence, of some state *beyond*, whether in Sheol, or after the dominion of Sheol, cannot, indeed, be said to be wholly wanting. It gleams upon us from certain passages, but as something repressed rather than as intended to be prominently revealed. It is kept back; a veil seems thrown over it; it is silenced, as it were, even in places where it would appear to be almost breaking through, and struggling to manifest itself in circumstances most adapted to call out its utterance. This is a remarkable feature of the Book, very suggestive in respect to its purpose,—its problem, as some would call it,—or, to speak more correctly, the lesson it truly teaches, whatever may be said as to its artistic design.

The Foundations of Religious Belief.

Two tenets are commonly regarded as fundamental in religion,—as indispensable, in fact, whatever else may be received or rejected. These are, 1st, the belief in a personal God having moral relations to a world of rational beings, a Ruler, Lawgiver and Judge, instead of a mere physical Creator; 2d, the belief in a future state for man, or of some higher life, however conceived, which shall give dignity to that relation, or make man a fit subject of a divine moral government appealing to the highest motives, and the most transcending reasons that can influence one appointed to such a destiny. They are the two necessary articles in every system of theology. Piety cannot exist without them. So it seems to us in the present age of the world. We find it difficult to think of religion as separate from some very clear and decided belief in another state of existence. And yet it has not always been so. Nothing is more certain than that, in the early days of the human world, this second article which, in certain kinds of modern religionism, seems to usurp the first place, to be the great dogma, in fact, giving its chief importance to the other, did certainly hold a very subordinate rank in the mind's conceptions. If it existed at all, its form was most shadowy and indefinite. It was a feeling rather than a dogma having any defining limits in respect to any conceived time, state, or locality. And yet there was a strong sense of a high moral relation between man and God,—a relation somehow eternal, though one of the parties was mainly thought of as finite, earthly, and mortal.

The Exalted Piety of the Patriarchal Life as compared with the Scantiness of its Creed.

Connected with this scanty creed, or rather with this wholly deficient creed, as we would deem it, there was an exalted piety, a rapt contemplation described as a "walking with God," an adoring view of the divine holiness, an ecstatic longing for the blessedness of the divine communion. Strange as this may seem, it cannot be denied whilst we have before us the history of those early patriarchs who appeared ever to live as in the presence of God, and to whose earthly existence this feeling gave such an unearthly aspect, though knowing nothing, seemingly, of any state beyond.

Difference between it and Modern Religionism.

It is difficult for us to conceive how it could have been so. Nothing of the kind is seen or known in our modern world. The creed of the materialist, or of the mortal Deist, as he is called, would seem outwardly to present but little difference from that of the patriarch in regard to this item of a future life, but how utterly does it repel every idea of such an exalted piety, such an adoring theism, as characterized these men who called their earthly stage a pilgrimage, but who knew not whither it tended, or what was its meaning, except that it was assigned to them by God. We never find such a belief now, or rather such an absence of belief, separated from some form of sheer worldliness, sensuality, animalism, ambition, utter selfishness in some aspect, vulgar or refined,—ever characterized by indifference to all religious thought, and wholly wanting in adoration or reverence for God, though theoretically believed.

Earliest Ideas of Death and of Continued Being.

It is not easy for us now to enter into the mind of the early men, and to understand precisely what view they took of the strange phenomenon of death, or what conception they formed of any possible after being. It was a cessation of visible activity, but we are not warranted in supposing that they regarded it as extinction, on the one hand, or that they formed any idea of something separating, going off, and continuing as a distinct *immaterial* existence, on the other. It was a great mystery in respect to which nothing had been told them, except that it was a condition into which men entered on account of sin. It was the *beginning* of something, so far as the mere act of dying or the cessation of activity was concerned, but they had nothing to warrant them in regarding it as an *end* of being. It was not annihilation. They had no such word or figure—no such conception to be expressed by it. It was a *state*, a state of being, instead of a ceasing to be. It was a penal state, and the first dawning of a better hope and of a more distinct idea must have arisen from the strong desire of deliverance from it as from a darkness and a prison, which, although they may have interrupted their conscious active powers, did not destroy their personal identity. It was a *state* strange and indescribable—inconceivable, we may also say—yet held, nevertheless, as a fact of which they could give no account. The body lies motionless before them. They see it beginning to undergo a fearful change. As far as sense is concerned, every thing seems at an end; and yet they continue to speak of the dead man as one who somehow yet *is*. He has yet relations to God and to the living. He is not all gone. His "blood cries from the ground." God has yet a care for him, and makes inquisition for him, as a yet remaining entity having rights and wrongs. Such language may have become mere empty figures as used now; but it could not well have become so in the early day; it meant something. They are gone from the congregation of the active living, but they are gathered into another—into a community of beings in a similar strange condition. Especially is this thought and said of the pious: "They are gathered to the fathers," "gathered to their people." The earthly living go to them; they come not back to us (Gen. xxxvii. 36). This is before any pictures of locality have been formed. Even those exceedingly dim conceptions first embodied in such words as Sheol and Hades had not yet assumed a rudimentary distinctness. The subterranean imagery had not yet grown out of the forms of burial. Still, even before all this, there was the feeling, the sentiment, of something in man, or belonging to man, that did not perish; and that, because of his vital moral relation to the ever Living God. "Because He lived," therefore, in some way they knew not how, and on some ground they did not understand, "they should live also." Hence that early Hebrew oath, which afterwards became so frequent, חי יהוה וחי נפשך, "as the Lord liveth and as thy soul liveth." Surely there was meaning in all this; it was not mere verbiage. From this arose that kind of language which, as we learn from 2 Sam. xxv. 29, afterward pervaded the common Jewish speech. Thus Abigail uses it to David as a sort of habitual or proverbial utterance of the formal religionism: "The soul of my lord bound up in the bundle of life, צרור החיים, with the Lord thy God." Compare also Ps. xxxvi. 10: "For with thee is the fountain of life, מקור החיים, in thy light do we see light." There is here "the *power* of an endless life," even though time conception and local scenery be wholly absent. It is astonishing that some of our most learned and most acute commentators see so little in such remarkable language, whilst so keen to find meaning in the common-place ethics, or mystical rhapsodies of Zoroastrian, Brahminic, or Confucian writings.

Pilgrims and Sojourners. The Covenant Idea.

This absence of local conception, and of forms of expression for it, should not lead us to imagine a complete destitution of the idea, or of the feeling, as we may rather call it. They were "strangers and pilgrims upon earth" (*ξένοι, παρεπίδημοι*, גֵּרִים), *way-farers;* "and they that say such things make it clear (*ἐμφανίζουσιν*) that they seek a country." At the command of God, it is said, they went out from their native land, "not knowing whither they went;" and the same may be said of their apparent departure from the earthly state of being: They went down to Sheol, not knowing whither they went, yet firmly trusting God, who had made

a "covenant with them well ordered in all things and sure." Hence the great significance of this covenant idea which forms so peculiar a feature of the Old Testament, and especially of the patriarchal, economy. God does not deal with them as He does with nature. He raises them above the plane of an arbitrarily imposed and an involuntarily accepted law. He stipulates with man, he proposes terms to him, as one rational mind to another. But such a transaction implies a greater being in the party thus treated than the transient earthly life. God deals not thus with creatures of a day. "He is not the God of the dead, but of the living." It is our Saviour's argument with the Sadducees, most rational, most Scriptural, and most conclusive, though some of the Rationalists have not hesitated to characterize it as a force upon the text quoted, and an evasion of the difficulty presented.

"THE POWER OF AN ENDLESS LIFE."

It cannot be denied that there may be a feeling, a sentiment, an influence, call it what we will, that may have an immense power over the soul, giving it a most peculiar character, and yet wholly undefined in the forms either of thought or of language. It may be the consciousness of some greater being, strongly felt, yet without any conceived accompaniments of time, state, and locality. It is that mysterious idea which characterized the priesthood of Melchizedeck, and which the Apostle calls "the power of an endless life," *δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου* (Heb. vii. 16),—of an indissoluble, unbroken being. It is a *power* truly instead of a bare dogmatic *idea*, and yet indissolubly connected with that other and higher idea of the eternal God, with its awful moral relations to the human soul.

It demands a Pure Theism first as the Ground of all other Religious Ideas.

Thus it is that these two great articles of religion, though inseparably connected in their essence, stand to each other in a causal relation of birth and development. The second, so far as respects its definiteness of conception, was to grow out of the first, and find in it its security against all perversion. To this end the first was to be clearly established, and to have the dominion of the soul, before the second assumed such form as might make it, in any degree, really or seemingly, independent of it. The clear acknowledgment of God as a moral Governor, whatever might become of man, or whatever might be thought of the duration or the importance of his being,—this was to be *first,* not only for its own sake as intrinsically greater than any other idea, but also on account of the second itself, as being a dogma, which, without such clear recognition of the greater dogma, might become vain, imaginative, grotesque, bringing in all kinds of monstrous chimeras on the one hand, or of pretty sentimentalities on the other, and, in either way, wholly losing all moral power.

Doctrine of a Future Life developed from it.

From the doctrine of the being, personality, moral government, and moral sovereignty of God, were to grow out all other religious ideas. Under the divine direction of human history, and especially of the people who were chosen to be keepers of truth for the world, their development in the soul was to be their revelation. The Scriptures are the record of this revelation, made by divinely chosen and divinely guided instruments; or rather it is the record of the circumstances and events, natural or supernatural, common or extraordinary, in which, under the divine control, these developments had their origin and growth. Thus the idea of retribution was born in the sharp human conviction of something due to great crime—awakening also the thought that there might be a heinousness in such crimes, and even in what were regarded as common sins, far beyond that ordinary estimate which might itself have fallen with fallen beings. In the murderer's conscience was born essentially the idea of Hell before any Hadean penalty was conceived of, either as to mode or locality. So the acknowledged relation of God as Moral Governor, as Redeeming Angel, as Covenant Friend, must have produced in the souls of the pious a feeling that becomes the preparation on which the idea of a blessed future being was, in time, firmly and definitely to rest. In such an acknowledged relationship there was this "power of an endless life," of infinite being, as the

germ of every idea that might afterwards be held in respect to the human destiny or the human soteriology.

The Hebrew Despondency more spiritual than any Heathen Confidence. Anacreon and David. Farewell to the World—Farewell to the Idea of God.

This appears even in their despondency, or their moments of apparent skepticism. There is really something more spiritual in the seeming despair, even, than in many a belief that might be regarded as greatly surpassing in dogmatic statement or conceptive clearness. To the worldly mind, with a dim hope of futurity, or even with one possessing some degree of distinctness, yet without moral power, the agonizing thought in view of death is the leaving behind this fair earth, with its prospects of pleasure or of ambition. See how it meets us in the heathen gnomic poetry, in the Greek monumental verses, and in the Choral odes of the Dramatists. Very affecting are such representations, as they may be all summed up sometimes in that touching expression so common in Homer: ὁρᾶν φάος ἠελίοιο—λείπειν φάος ἠελίοιο—"to see no more, to leave forever, the light of the sun." See EURIPIDES HIPPOL. 4; PHŒNISS. 8; IPHIG. in *Aul.* 1218, ἡδὺ γὰρ τὸ φῶς βλέπειν, "For O 'tis sweet the sunlight to behold." To bid farewell to this loved life, with all its worldly hopes: such was the burden of the heathen song, whether tuned to the Anacreontic or the more solemn tragic key. How differently affected in view of death was the pious Shemitic mind, whether as represented in the patriarchal, the Jobean, or the more common Israelitish life. "I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord," says the dying Jacob; though should the Rationalist maintain that there is no evidence of the patriarch having any distinct hope of a life beyond the grave, it would not be easy to refute him. But greater still is the difference, we may say, when all seemed dark respecting that other unknown shore. To the pious descendant of Jacob, in such a season of despondency, the great grief of his departure was the bidding farewell to God—if the expression does not seem too strange—or the going out forever of that idea which had been his life, his higher life, even here on earth: "Shall the dead praise *Thee?* Shall one speak of *Thy* goodness in the grave, *Thy* faithfulness [אמונתך, thy covenant faithfulness] in Abaddon (the world of the perished)? Shall *Thy* miracles be known in the darkness, *Thy* righteousness in the land of oblivion?" Ps. lxxxviii. 11, 13. So Ps. vi. 6: "In Sheol who shall make confession unto thee?" It was to be parted forever from that soul-vision of the Divine eternity, the loss of which was sorer than any diminution of their own being considered merely in itself. Hence the affecting contrasts of man's dying, going out, passing away, and God's everlasting continuance. The contemplation of this is the reason assigned in praying for the continuance of the human life. "O take me not away in the midst of my days; *Thy* years are through all generations." "Thou sendest man back to dissolution (עַד דַּכָּא, to decay and dust), and thou sayest, return ye sons of Adam." "But Thou art from everlasting unto everlasting;" "of thy years there is no end;" לא יתמו, they never fail. There is, however, a rising hope of eternity in the very thought, as though reflected back on the human soul that thus contemplated itself in God, and leading it to say: "Thou hast been to us our dwelling-place in all generations;" or in the rapt language of the Prophet: "Art Thou not from everlasting, Jehovah, my God, my Holy One? We shall not die." Hab. i. 12.

This "Power of an Endless Life," thus implied, stronger than any Dogmatic Utterance.

It is in these and in similar ways that the inspired feeling—for such we may call it even in its apparent skepticism—breathes itself out in many a passage where not a word is said dogmatically of any future state, and yet the language seems all filled with this "power of an endless life." Thus in the "Psalm of Asaph," lxxiii. 24: "Whom have I in the Heavens (but Thee); and in all the earth there is nothing that I desire beside Thee."—עִמְּךָ in comparison with Thee. Take away this æonic inspiration, and all, at once, collapses. The language, regarded as coming from a mere worldly soul, speaking from a worldly stand-point, is wholly overstrained. There is nothing to call out a state of feeling so high and rapturous.* "My flesh and my heart (my body and my soul) both fail, but *Thou* art the strength (the rock)

* General application.

of my heart, and my portion (חֶלְקִי, my decreed or allotted portion) for ever." Not a word here, it may be said, of immortality, or of any life beyond the grave; no one would quote it as a proof-text for the doctrine dogmatically considered; and yet the *power* is there—the *δύναμις ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου*—"the power of an endless life."

Examples from Job—God mourned for more than his Loss or Pain.

So is it with Job, though the darkness and sadness of his outward state gives a different form to the expression. The loss of property he hardly mentions—his bereavement of his children he barely alludes to; but it is for God he mourns—for the hiding of His face, "the light of His countenance," that ineffable good for which our purest modern religion finds its best expression in the language of this ancient theism. Such a feeling is not inconsistent with the daring, and, as they seem to us, almost profane, expostulations wrung from him by the long continuance of his sharp bodily pains. In every subsidence of this great misery—for there must have been such seasons of remission, or he could not have borne it—there returns again the humbled, mourning spirit, with its divine want: "O that I knew where I might find Him; O that I might set my cause in order before Him; that I might know the words He would answer me," xxiii. 3, 5; "Wherefore hidest Thou Thy face?" xiii. 24; "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him,"* xiii. 15. From the lowest depth, hope springs up. Just after he had said, "My face is foul with weeping, and the death shade is on my eyelids" (xvi. 16), he cries out, "Even now my Witness is in Heaven, my Attestor is on high," † xvi. 19; "My friends are my mockers, but mine eye droppeth unto God," 20. The tearful appeal is made as unto a better friend, who, in the days of his prosperity, had never been absent from his soul's most cherished thoughts: "O that it were with me as in months that are past, in the days when God watched over me (ישמרני), when His lamp shone upon my head, when by His light I walked through darkness; when the Almighty was with me; when the *secret* of God [סוד, *consessus colloquium,* His secret presence and communion, see Ps. xxv. 14] was upon my tabernacle," xxix. 2–4. Our highest rationalism has now no such remembrance and no such mourning. It may talk of the dimness of Job's views, the inadequate conceptions entertained by the author of the poem in respect to the character of God, or the absence of any clear mention of a future life, but his darkness is better than their light; his intense theistic feeling is stronger than their theory; they have no such skepticism, perhaps, because they have no such faith.

Longing for God as distinguishing the Hebrew Theism from all other.

It is the same feeling, as characteristic of this ancient theism, which breaks out in that ecstatic longing before alluded to: "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God!" Picture the image of the thirsting animal (moaning, with outstretched neck, as ערג vividly denotes) in its intense desire for the refreshing element; then transfer it to the rational sphere, and we see that it is a superhuman, earth-transcending good that is so ardently sought. "My soul thirsteth for God, for the *living* God"—for the God of life. The epithet is not a superfluity. It distinguishes Him from the dead *idol,* on the one hand, and the equally dead *idea,* or theosophism, on the other. "It is Thy favor which is life, Thy loving-kindness which is more than life." Again, Ps. lxiii. 1: "O God! O Thou my God! my soul thirsteth for Thee, my flesh longeth for Thee [כלה, denoting that strong passion which makes even the body faint under the intensity of its desire) as in a dry and thirsty land wherein no water is." Our Saviour shows His estimate of the power of this language by consecrating the image in His own highest term for spiritual blessedness—the "wa-

* The Keri here (לו for לא) of the Masoretic text must be very ancient, since it is sustained by the Syriac, the Targum, the Vulgate, and the Arabic of Saadias. It is in the closest grammatical harmony with the verb איחל; and no one can deny that the rendering produced is in perfect consistency with the spirit of the whole Book.

† שׂהדי. A word from the same root in Arabic means attesting angel, or angels: *Angeli, testes in ultimo judicio.* See Koran Surat. xi. 21. Is not the שָׂהֵד or Attestor, on whom Job calls here, the same with the גֹּאֵל xix. 25?

ter of life," the "fountain leaping up to everlasting life." There is no mistaking the significance of such an appeal to God. No joy in this world without the beatific sense of the divine presence.

Transition from Despondency to Rapture. *Job* xix. 25.

Such was this ancient theism. It carried with it "the power of an endless life," without any dogmatic mention, and this is the reason why the highest emotion of modern religion still finds in it its most adequate, as well as its most impassioned, expression. There is less of it in Job; but there, too, we find it, carrying him, sometimes, out of the deepest despondency into a spiritual region where his sharpest pains seem, for the moment, forgotten. In the first part of ch. xix. it seems to be all over with him. No hope, either for body or for soul: "He hath fenced up my way, that I cannot pass; He hath set darkness in my path; He hath broken me down on every side, and I am gone; He uproots, like a tree, my hope; my bone cleaves to my skin, and to my flesh; I am laid bare, the skin from my teeth." * A little before (xvii. 1), he had said, "My breath (my breathing) is exhausted" (חֻבָּלָה, not "*corrupt*," but from the other sense of חָבַל, denoting great pain, as of one in travail, hard and painful breathing, quick panting); my breath comes hard, my days are going out (נזעכו), the graves are my portion." v. 11, 12. "My purposes are broken off, even the treasured thoughts of my heart," all my pleasant earthly remembrances. The light is departing. "They† are putting night for day:" the shades of death are gathering fast around him. All hope of life is gone, much more the expectation of restored wealth and worldly prosperity, which the rationalist would regard as the only significance of the triumphal strain that follows, xix. 25. He is *in extremis;* but such is the very time when this "power of an endless life" asserts itself. At the lowest ebb, as though such a time had been necessary to bring out its returning force, he breaks forth with those ever memorable words so sublime and super-earthly in spite of every lowering strain that criticism will put upon them, the words he wished "engraved," as his monument, "with an iron stile and lead in the rock forever:"

I KNOW THAT MY REDEEMER LIVETH:

My Avenger, who takes my part against my murderer or the great unseen evil Power of whose hostility Job sometimes seems to have a kind of dreamy consciousness. There is the same idea of survivorship so touchingly alluded to in the Psalms. He is my אחרון, my Nachmann, my Next of Kin. *He* lives on; "and after they‡ have broken up this skin of mine, yet from my flesh (or out of my flesh, translate it as we will) shall I see God"—see Him with the eyes of my soul, and not with any outwardly derived theoretical knowledge—see Him as the Living God, as *my* God, and not a stranger. This beatific thought of God as "all his salvation and all his desire" carries him out of and far away from himself. It becomes an insupportable rapture giving rise to that same intense language before referred to in the 63d Psalm, and elsewhere. It is that most passionate verb כלה, having for its subject the paronomastic noun כליות (the reins, *renes*, *φρενες*), denoting the most interior part of the body, re-

* It would seem to denote that ghastly look, and that ghastly condition of extreme emaciation, when the skin will no more close over the protruding teeth. This sense may be got for מלט without going to the corresponding Arabic word. It is closely connected with the common Hebrew sense of *escape* or *deliverance* (one thing *parting* or *parted* from another). It is like the accusative with preposition after passive verbs denoting condition. *I am parted*, *the skin of my teeth*, or *in* the skin of my teeth—that is, the flesh that covers my teeth. It denotes the extreme of emaciation and suffering.

† ישימו. "*They* are putting." Who are *they?* It is one of those cases where the agent, real or supposed, is not named because of something fearful, perhaps, associated with it. "They"—*invisible powers*, it may be, either actually believed or used figuratively or proverbially to heighten the effect of the language. Grammarians call it the using of the active for the passive impersonal, but this does not explain the matter. As parallel passages, compare Job vii. 3, iv. 19, xviii. 18, xix. 26; Ps. xlix. 15, and especially the Greek of Luke xii. 20. It is generally used by way of deprecating something hostile. But it may also be from reverence. See Isaiah ix. 11.

‡ The same idiom referred to in the note above. They, the agent, too fearful or too revolting to be named, may refer to the worms reducing his skin to shreds, or to the strange hostile powers that were then destroying his body through disease, regarded as produced by evil agency.

garded as in nearest connection with the spiritual emotion: "My reins faint within me," כלו כליותי בחקי. *Consuming, exhaustion, completion,* are the primary sense, hence, of *disappearing* (*schwinden*), *going out, fainting, swooning* with ecstatic joy. Ewald's treatment of the passage is most admirable. He, however, refers זר to Job himself, and makes the personal idea conveyed by it one of the chief elements of his insupportable bliss: "*Nicht ein Fremder*, no more a stranger. It is no other than myself; no, no; all doubt is gone. It is I (*ich, ich*), I that shall thus behold Him. So deeply does he feel the bliss, that he seems to have wholly forgotten the outer world; and finally, in the highest transport, like one swooning, he cries out, *O ich vergehe*, O I am almost gone; I faint from trembling joy and insupportable desire." EWALD, *Job*, p. 200. He refers to Psalms lxxxiv. 3, cxix. 8. Compare also the use of *οἴχεται* by the Greek Dramatists, *καρδία γὰρ οἴχεται*.

Similar Fluctuations of Faith and Hope. Job xiv.

It is the same feeling, though in a calmer or less ecstatic form, that prompts the language, Job xiv. 13: מי יתן בשאול תצפנני, "O that Thou wouldst lay me up (like a deposit) in Sheol, that Thou wouldst keep me secret till Thy wrath should *turn* (שוב), that Thou wouldst appoint me a time and then remember me." Is it really so? The thought suddenly breaks out of his gloom: "Is it really so: If a man die, shall he live again?" Every thing depends here upon what we regard as the emotional point of the question. The musing, soliloquizing style should also be remembered. It is not so much answering his friends, as talking to himself, and pausing between each solemn utterance. It may be the language of skepticism, or of rising hope, not denying the idea, but expressive of wonder at some new aspect of its greatness. It may have been intended—and the thought is not unworthy of inspiration—that different readers, according to their different degrees of spiritual-mindedness, might take higher or lower views of the strange interrogatory. Even for Job himself it may have had its various aspects. There may have been intended the denial or the doubt; or there may have been the feeling of wonder before mentioned; or it may have been an entirely new view, carrying with it a rising assurance: "If a man die, shall he live?" May it be that death is the way to life? *—that through it we attain the real life? However momentary the feeling, it immediately raises him to a higher confidence. Its first fruit is the earnest prayer for remembrance and security in Sheol; then the stronger faith grounded on the more unreserved submission: "All the days of my *appointment*" (what he had prayed for in the verse preceding) will I wait until my change † shall come." And now we have language which seems to mount

---

* It is the same style of musing query given in Plato, *Gorgias*, 493, A, by way of extract from a lost drama of Euripides:

> Τίς δ' οἶδεν, ἐι τὸ ζῆν μέν ἐστὶ κατθανεῖν,
> Τὸ κατθανεῖν δὲ ζῆν?
>
> Who knows but life, the present life, be death,
> And death be living?

Socrates explains it from the saying of *the wise men of old*, "that we are now dead and buried in the body." Who shall say that the same, or a kindred thought, may not have come to an Idumean sage, as well as to the old *σοφοί* to whom Plato ascribes it?

† Umbreit and other commentators of the same school will have it that the *change* here is that from life to death. The arguments against it are threefold. There is, *first*, the consistency of the context. *Secondly*, if חליפה stood here alone, without any thing to determine it one way or the other, it might be said that in other passages the transition denoted by the root is that of *renewal*, whenever connected with the idea of life, as in Ps. xc. 3; Ps. cii. 27, where it seems to denote a new garment for nature, a change of raiment in the sense of renewal. There is, *thirdly*, the direct use of יחליף, the Hiphil, for *reviviscence*, in the seventh verse, as applied to the comparison of the tree. Would the noun here, so obviously from it, so soon lose the same idea, and be taken in another directly opposite? and is there not the strongest critical reason for regarding the use of the noun in ver. 14 as suggested by the parallel thought, ver. 7: "Even as there is hope of a tree that it will germinate again (יחליף), so also will I wait until my *springing* forth, my חליפה, come." "For Thou wilt call," *etc.*

to almost full assurance: "For Thou *wilt* call and I will answer Thee; Thou wilt yearn * towards the work of Thy hands." The darkness soon comes over him again; but these words stand, nevertheless, like the monumental engraving that describes the rapture of the later passage. Even as Ewald describes him then, he seems, for a short period, so carried away by the deep question he is pondering, as to have forgotten the outer world and all his surroundings. "Thou *wilt* have regard to the work of Thy hands; Thou *wilt* call and I will answer." It is "the power of an endless life," carrying him for a moment beyond the thought of death, or suffering, or human injustice. It is, however, but a transient gleam, and the close of the chapter—following, we may suppose, a pause or pauses in his soliloquy—becomes again as mournful as its beginning. One inference most strongly suggests itself from all this. There is a true experience here, an actual life that is lived. A soul went through these sorrows. It had these transitions of hope and despair—now moaning and expostulating with God, now rapt in the deepest meditation, now praying and trusting, now utterly cast down, and now, when "the light is just before darkness," as Dr. Conant renders xvii. 12, rising suddenly to a height of rapture in which every thing disappears before the beatific vision of God. To a mind in a right state there comes from this an irresistible argument for the actual truthfulness of the history, not only in its general outlines, but also in what has been called its dramatic representation. This is not an *invented* picture. It would require a power and a style of writing not only unknown to the early world, but surpassing the highest skill of modern fiction, even could we suppose the greatest dramatists of Grecian, German, or English literature capable of describing such a state of soul, or of descending, without divine aid, into the depths of such an experience.

Bidding Farewell to God; this Idea in the Psalms connected with the Temple and Ritual Worship.

In language like this we have quoted from Job and the Psalms, every hope of future being, or of any greater or higher being now connected with the earthly life, is sustained by, and derived from, the idea of God. It is this which gives such a preciousness to everything associated with the divine name. In the Psalms, however, there is a peculiar feature most worthy of note, because leading to a most important inference. In the expression of the glorious divine attributes, and of man's great need of God, their theism is substantially the same with that of Job and the Patriarchs. A new element, however, appears in the passionate language used in respect to the outward divine worship. The occasional feeling of despondency in view of death, as before referred to, is enhanced by the thought of leaving every thing on earth associated with the divine name,—the temple, the sanctuary, the altar, "the courts of Thine house." See the prayer of Hezekiah, Isaiah xxxviii. Similar to this is the longing expressed when circumstances, even in this life, have cut them off from privileges so highly prized: "O when shall I come and appear before the face of God?" "How lovely are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts! *Longs*, yea, even *faints* (נכספה גם כלתה) my soul for the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh cry aloud (ירננו) for the *Living* God." Hence that endeared expression בית יהוה, "the house of the Lord," used not only for the temple, the place of worship, but for the people of God who worship there. A still further extension of the idea makes it denote the religious as distinguished from the worldly life, or even as something transcending the earthly state, though undefined in time and space. As Ps. xxiii. 4: "I shall dwell in the house of the Lord for ever." In that verse our translation may be amended. The words שבתי בבית יהוה, all belong to the subject of the sentence, as even the accents show: "My dwelling in the House of the Lord—shall be, לארך ימים, for length of days," that is, *continuously*, or without interruption: My religious life shall not be simply on Sabbath-days, or on the stated festivals, but one un-

* תכסף. Primary sense, *palluit*, the *face growing pale*, like silver, from strong desire. We have used Dr. Conant's admirable translation, "*yearns*." In Ps. lxxxiv. 3 it is used, together with כלה, to denote the longing of the pious soul for God, and that makes more impressive here the converse idea of God's yearning love for man.

broken adoration. Comp. Rev. iv. 8. It is thus that, when far removed, or deprived in any way of this divine presence, they so earnestly pray:

O send again that heavenly hour,
That vision so divine,

"Even Thy strength and Thy glory, as we have seen them in the Sanctuary. For better is Thy love than life; our lips shall ever praise Thee. Thus will I bless Thee while I live; thus, in Thy name, lift up my hands. As with marrow and fatness (beyond comparison with any earthly pleasure), so shall my soul be satisfied; with songs of joy shall my mouth glorify Thee." It is a spiritual joy, transcending any "good of corn and wine." It is a soul-worship, a soul-rapture, no mere affair of trumpets, incense, altars, or cherubic symbols, no imposing ceremonial, however gorgeous or comely its forms, however elevating or pietistic its influence. "In the shadow of Thy wings do I trust." The outward temple worship suggests the image, but it is in deepest retirement that its power is felt: "For surely I remember Thee upon my bed; I meditate upon Thee in the watches of the night; my *soul followeth hard after Thee;* Thy right hand upholdeth me." It is an absorbing devotion; the whole heart is there; the highest thoughts of God are there; it is a model which our best modern worship may strive to reach but cannot surpass. "*For better is Thy love than life:*" No mere rationalistic theism *now* talks to itself in this way; it was no mere theosophy, much less any known form of patrial or local worship that used the language *then.* It is an abiding sense of the power of this ancient devotion that has made the Psalms, in all ages, the Litany of the Christian Church.

Inference from the Absence of all such Language in Job.

It is true that there are no passages of this latter kind in the Book of Job; but the inference from the fact is most obvious as well as most important. The story of that book, and even the seances (the dramatic discourses) as recorded, to say nothing of any later writer or recorder, were long before those inspiring temple and tabernacle ideas. They were before the Mosaic Law. That has been ably maintained as proof of the patriarchal character of the book, and we think that some of our modern Evangelical Commentators, such as Hengstenberg, and others, have been rash in giving up a view sustained by so profound a scholar as Spanheim, and indirectly supported by so learned an Orientalist as Schultens. *Ni historia sit, fraus scriptoris,* says the former. A pure dramatic work, avowed to be such, or carrying evidence of its dramatic character upon its very face, might have a place in inspired Scripture regarded as given by God for human instruction. Almost every other style of writing is there. But a parable, an allegory, a myth even, we at once know to be such. There is no concealment, no attempt to conceal, no artifice employed to put in what does not belong to the time of the composition, or to keep out what would at once undeceive the reader in regard to the appearance it would maintain. Such an intention, so employed, seems certainly akin to fraud. No subsequent writer was ever led to regard our Saviour's Parables as actual histories; but such, certainly, was the view derived by the Prophet Ezekiel from this Book of Job, then a part of the Jewish Canon. He no more regarded it as unreal than the histories, as contained in the same Canon, or firmly held by tradition, of Noah and Daniel.

Difficulties of the pure Dramatic view in excluding all reference to the Divine Law and Testimony so frequent in the Psalms.

According to the pure dramatic view, the writer selects a "hero," wholly imaginary, or faintly disclosed in the dimmest nucleus of an ancient legend. He clothes him with the character of the patriarchal age. He carefully keeps from him, and from the speakers with whom he is associated, the least reference to the Mosaic law. This might be comparatively easy, if it lay before him as a written document, which he might at any time examine, comparing it with his own work, and expunging or modifying as the case might demand. But there would be something far more difficult. The Jewish liturgical writings, older than the time ascribed by most modern critics to the Book of Job, abound in references to this

old law. They give it a great variety of names, such as statutes, judgments, ordinances, testimonies. See how this kind of language is multiplied in the cxix. Psalm, and in others certainly older, if the cxix. is to be carried down to a late date. Language is taxed to express this ardent devotion of the soul, this ecstatic love of the comparatively limited revelation God had as yet given to the world, and that, too, veiled, for the most part, under outward and ceremonial ordinances. Yet what a rapture does it call out for the spiritual mind: "O how love I Thy law! Thy word is very pure, therefore Thy servant loveth it; The entrance of Thy word giveth light; Great peace have they who love Thy testimonies; Thy precepts are my delight (שַׁעֲשֻׁעָי, in the plural, *deliciæ meæ*, my exceeding joy) sweet to my taste, yea, sweeter than the honey, or the droppings of the comb." What care must it have taken to avoid anything of this kind! How still more difficult to keep clear of any such language as we first set forth, not referring to the Law, even indirectly, but deriving its spirit from it, and full of those remembrances of the sanctuary, and of the outward worship which were its fruit. All this kept out!* not the slightest anachronism to be discovered, nothing but what is perfectly consistent with that far more ancient Patriarchal age to which the writer evidently wishes the reader to regard his imaginary hero and history as belonging. It is incredible.

Such Dramatic Skill and Invention out of Harmony with the Idea of Inspiration, and even of the highest Order of Genius.

It would be wholly at war with that simplicity and truthfulness which we cannot separate from the idea of a holy and inspired writer. Such studied precaution would be inconsistent even with the lower human enthusiasm demanded for such a work of genius. It would simply be the genius of invention, and not even a miracle could carry it out of itself and into that higher sphere towards which it soars. Moreover, such a style of writing is inconsistent with any idea we can form of the earliest times. Modern fictitious writing has carried the art to its utmost capabilities, but even here it stops short (as from the very nature of the case it must) of the highest order of genius. It always fails when it attempts to meddle with the most sacred themes. We may confidently repeat it, therefore, that such success in such an effort, by a writer of the days of Solomon, is simply incredible.

But why not, then, take it as it purports to be—a true story of the Patriarchal age—and a substantially true report of discourses arising out of it, given in that chanting semi-rhythmical style that we know was earliest employed for the expression of all thoughts of a higher order, or regarded as having an extraordinary value. It is the same reflective, meditative, self-repeating rhythm, requiring little or no outward artifice, that we see in some of the earliest chants in Genesis, in the Song of Miriam, and in the Oracles of Balaam, the Prophet and Poet of the early East. It was the same, probably, from which the later fixed style of Hebrew poetry derived its origin. There seems to be demanded some ancient work of great repute to be the standard of authority for the later parallelistic chanting, and to give it rule and fixedness; just as Homer became the model of the Hexameter for all later Epic poetry of the Greeks.

Internal Truthfulness. Place of Job in Hebrew Literature.

There are other alleged stumbling-blocks, and other objections to the historical reality of the Book, such as the appearance of Satan in the Prologue, the round and double numbers in the narrative, and the theophany at the close, which may be treated elsewhere. In regard, however, to the substantial subject-matter of the story, it may well be asked, why may

* The author is represented as showing the most marvellous skill in keeping out every allusion to things most deeply interwoven in the Israelitish life. All is foreign and antique. And yet Commentators who maintain this, find the grossest anachronisms in the Book, whenever they can serve the purpose of assigning to it some comparatively modern period. Thus, Merx, p. xli., finds in ch. xv. 15, 19, an allusion to the Assyrian invasion of 760, or to the fact that foreigners were in the land, and obscuring all the old ideas. Eliphaz is made to refer to the older people "to whom alone was given the land." It is very much the same as if one professing to give a dramatic picture of the Pilgrim Fathers, and striving to keep every thing in harmony with that early time, should suddenly betray himself by an allusion to the late Rebellion. But, with some, the greatest inconsistency is excusable, if it will favor the latest date that can be given to the Book.

it not be received, as we receive the early narrations in Genesis? What is there in the testing, the sufferings, and the final integrity of Job, more difficult of belief than the similar account and similar lesson of Abraham's templation, or of Jacob's long probation, or of the strange vicissitudes of Joseph's history, or of the exile and severe trials of Moses? Such questions it would, indeed, be difficult to answer; but the main thing here is that for which there have been cited these glowing passages from the Psalms, containing ideas so apropros to the author's supposed times, but which have no counterpart in the record of his hero's thoughts and sayings, either by way of resemblance or of contrast. The inference is a very rational one. It shows that Job lived—and the first reporter, too, we think—not only before the giving of the Mosaic Law, but at that still earlier time when there was, indeed, a most sublime theism, but when there had not yet been developed the forms or the idea of local outward worship in gathered assemblies. There were no temples, no sanctuaries, no sacred places. It was at the time when the family was the Church, in which the father was head and priest; when pious men knew each other, and held intercourse, as did Abraham and Melchizedeck, but when holy days and rites (except sacrifice), and outward collective worship, as such, were things unknown. That such things should have been before the time of Job, and yet without the most remote allusion to them in the Book, seems most incredible, even though the greatest pains had been taken to keep them out. The *spirit* of such ideas, and of such observances, would have somehow come in, in spite of every effort to exclude the *letter*. To this collective or temple worship, or sanctuary holiness, revelation had not yet educated even the pious mind. To say nothing, however, of inspiration, or of the divine purposes, and viewing it as a mere question of criticism, it may be maintained that the consistency of Hebrew literature, *as we find it*, demands that there should be assigned in it a very ancient place to the Book of Job. Such we believe, too, would be the almost unanimous decision of Rationalism, should a similar question, and on similar grounds, be raised in regard to Greek or Hindu writings.

IDEAS OF A FUTURE LIFE AMONG SURROUNDING NATIONS;

Alleged to be more clear than those of the Hebrews.

At any date that may be taken for the Book of Job, there was, unquestionably, among the surrounding nations a belief in a future life that had assumed the form of a dogma possessed of a good degree of definiteness in regard to state and conceived local aspect. Such was the case even with Shemitic nations other than the Hebrew. The Syrians had it. Paréau has shown that such a belief existed among the early Arabians. There is proof of it, moreover, from the Koran, all the more satisfactory as it comes in incidentally by way of unquestioned reference. Repeatedly in the contests of Mohammed with the infidels of his day do they characterize as fables of the ancients,* as ideas once firmly held in the earlier simple world, but now regarded as antiquated and wholly obsolete, *asatiru 'lawwalina*, those doctrines of a future life, and of a resurrection, which he professed to revive and to urge upon them. If we may trust Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, the most ancient Egyptians had a similarly clear belief. Says the latter, Lib. I., sec. 51, "The abodes of the *living* they call καταλύσεις, temporary lodging-places or inns, those of the departed (τετελευτηκότων, the *dead*, not as extinguished, or non-existent, but as a state of being), they call ἀϊδίους οἴκους, everlasting mansions." The idea of the present life as a pilgrimage would seem akin to that expressed in the patriarchal language: "Pilgrims and strangers upon the earth," and may have been derived from it; but there the Hebrew mind, and the Hebrew imagination was stayed. A home to that pilgrimage was indeed implied, and in that they rested. "They went out, not knowing whither they went," nor making any inquiry, nor indulging in any fancy about it, but committing everything to their covenant God. The Egyptian imagination, on the other hand, unchecked by any divine purpose in the develop-

* See Surat. xxiii. 85: "How is it that when we are dead, and have become dust and bones, that we live again? They are only *fables of the ancients*, v. 38. Away, then, with what we are threatened with! There is no other life. We live and we die, and then we live no more. They are but stories of the early times." See, also, xxvi. 137, xxvii. 69, 70.

ment of the doctrine, ran on and made a distinct Hadean world of it, with its distinctly conceived abodes. The idea being separated, too, almost wholly, from that of the personal God, or being independently held as something by itself, became gross and earthly, as though it were a living in catacombs and pyramids, and surrounded by a funereal imagery. Other ancient peoples pictured the thought with lighter and more cheerful accompaniments. We need not refer to the Chaldæans, the Persians, and the Hindoos, as early possessing the idea of a future life; for with them the rationalist has no difficulty. It is only in regard to the Jews that he finds it hard to believe in anything spiritual or unearthly. *They* could only have learned it from foreign sources; but, in regard to these foreign sources themselves, no questions need be raised. All is easy, except when some strange feeling—of the true nature of which they are, perhaps, not distinctly aware—prompts them to deny all traces of such ideas as originating in the Scriptures, or as being first held, or independently held, by the Hebrew mind. So far, however, as regards these surrounding nations, they are undoubtedly correct. They all had a more or less distinct doctrine of a future life. On that of the Greeks we need not dwell. In the times referred to, in the Iliad and the Odyssey, a local Hadean world of spirits was distinctly conceived and universally held. So was it among the people of Western Europe. The best testimony shows that the Druids, or Celtic priesthood, possessed it, even in that early day.

The Veil thrown over the Doctrine in the Old Testament.

And now here is the wonder which has stumbled many. How is it that such a belief, so universal, so intimately connected, as it would seem, with the very life of religion in any form, and without which we find it difficult to conceive of its having any power for the soul—how is it that such a belief should have been so faint among the people who are called the people of God? Why so little mentioned, if mentioned at all, by those who were chosen as depositaries of the great world-ideas, or the truths by which the race was finally to be regenerated? The wonder is enhanced by the fact that this Hebrew people, the pious among them, had the most exalted ideas of the Divine Being, and the Divine Holiness, so far surpassing all who seemed to be before them, in a distinct conception of the other doctrine. How is it that in Homer the belief is so clearly expressed, whilst in Job it is so veiled? It is altogether stranger from the fact that in Homer there seems little or no demand for it—no moral demand, we mean—whilst in Job the attending spiritual circumstances are such as would appear to call for it in almost every appeal, whether of charge or response. It would have cleared up the great debate at once. So we would have thought. Instead of being used, however, for any such purpose, it seems actually repressed when about to make its appearance. In places where it may be said to have actually broken through the surrounding darkness, it is only for a moment that it shines. It is laid aside; the gloom returns; the old difficulties again crowd the path of their ever-circling argument. So is it elsewhere in the Old Scriptures. The more pious the mind, the more exalted its conceptions of God, the greater the *reserve* on this point; so that even when it seems to be expressed, or implied, the greatest care is used to exhibit its dependence on the higher idea. The *personal* God is ever the controlling as well as the fundamental thought: "Thou wilt show me the way of life;" "I shall be satisfied when I awake in Thy likeness;" "Thou wilt guide me by *Thy* counsel, and afterwards receive me to glory."* In other cases, it is simply the

* It was only, however, by the more pious and meditative, or those who were chosen as the mediums of the written revelation, that the power of this reserve was chiefly felt. That the vulgar Jewish mind had the same views of a ghost-world as prevailed among other nations of antiquity, and as now popularly prevail, is proved by the most unmistakable evidence. We need only refer to such passages as Lev. xix. 31, xx. 6, 27; Deut. xviii. 11; 2 Kings xxi. 16; Isa. viii. 19, xxix. 4. They show a belief so strong and prevalent, in the continued existence of the dead, that there had arisen, in the very earliest times, a class of persons who professed to be mediums of communication between the two worlds. They are called אובות, ידענים, Necromancers, or "Seekers to the dead," דרשים אל מתים. Our modern Spiritualism is only a revived form of this impiety, so early condemned. Another example is furnished by the case of Saul and the Witch of Endor, 1 Sam. xxviii. 3. Whether these were wholly or partly imposture, makes no difference in the argument. Such practices could only have been grounded on a very prevalent popular belief in a ghost-world. Here as elsewhere, the idea, when left to itself, became only the nourisher of a pestilent superstition; because the thought of God, as the conservative

expression of the divine care for man, and the strange importance attached to his acts and moral condition; as when Job says, xiv. 3, "Upon such a one dost *Thou* open *Thine* eye, and bring *me* into judgment with *Thee?*" "What is man that Thou shouldst be so mindful of him?" Again, it is the expression of a soul absorbed in Deity, as it were: "Whom have I in Heaven, or upon the earth, but THEE?" No mention is made of another life, but the power, as we have said, is there; the dogmatic presence is simply veiled in the splendor of the higher idea.

Reasons for this Reserve.

Now there must have been some divine purpose in all this. May we not reverently conclude that such a reserve, in respect to the precious idea of the human immortality, was for the very purpose of preserving it in its highest strength and purity? All other nations had marred the doctrine. They had early received it, and early perverted it. They exercised upon it all the license of an unrestrained imagination. They turned it into fables. They deformed it in every way; or, in endeavoring to add to its mythical interest, they took from it all its moral power. God did not mean thus to give up His own people to their fancies. He had some better thing for them, especially for the more pious and spiritual in Israel. Hence this veil upon the sacred idea, and its indissoluble connection with the divine. It was not because the Hebrews were deficient in imagination. The vulgar belief in a ghost-world, to which we have referred (see note, p. 13), shows that they let it rove, just as all other ancient peoples did, and even to an extent which required divine legislation for its suppression. We can not compare the mythical fancies that seem so universally prevalent with the reserve that was maintained in the Book of Job, or in the utterances of David, Solomon, and the Prophets, without acknowledging the presence of a divine restraint, making the Jewish literature, in this, as well as in its sublime theistic aspect, so different from that of all surrounding or cotemporary nations.

Objections to the Hebrew Scriptures. Alleged Superiority of the Greeks. Homer, Pindar, et al.

And yet this very thing has been urged as an argument against the Bible, and against the spirituality of the Old Testament writers. The very fact that it was esteemed too awful a doctrine for utterance, or even for the imagination, has been used as a testimony against its existence in any form. Witness the effort to explain away every passage which may seem, in any way, directly or indirectly, capable of such a meaning. The Greeks, it has been said, were far beyond them in the development of the doctrine of another life. As early as Homer, and long before Homer—for it could not have sprung up at once—they had a defined topography of the Hadean land. Besides the mysterious spirit-world in its general aspect, as graphically detailed in the XI. Book of the Odyssey, there was the more special abode of the blessed, according to the Greek conception of blessedness. Beyond the earth, or at the extremity of the earth, ἐς πείρατα γαίης, Odyssey, iv. 563, they had their "Elysian Plain, where presided in judgment the golden-haired Rhadamanthus, where life is ever free

idea, became dissociated from it, just as in the modern doctrine, and the modern practice that so closely resembles it. Hence such a belief, instead of being encouraged, is most sharply condemned in the Scriptures. The great guilt consisted in meddling with what belonged solely to God, to be revealed or veiled according to the divine wisdom. The practice of such necromancy prevailed most under the most wicked kings, such as Manasseh; and its evil in the Divine sight is shown by the vehement denunciations of the Prophet: The farther the people departed from God, the more common became this "seeking to the dead."

Glimpses, however, of a better *popular* belief in some higher and purer spirit-world appear in the Book of Job itself. Whether the word רוח, in the Vision of Eliphaz, iv. 15, denote a spirit, or a breath, the whole context intimates a communication supposed to come from another world. Calling it a dream makes no difference, since dreams show the course of human thinking and belief. The thing, however, most worthy of note in this view, is the nature of the communication made. How different, in this respect, from the modern spiritualism referred to! There is nothing to gratify curiosity—no talk about "spheres," and "progress, or a "coming light," but a most solemn *moral* announcement. It is for this alone that the separating curtain is for a moment withdrawn. No disclosure is made of states or scenes within. The regulating divine idea is all-controlling. That must first of all be learned in its ineffable holiness: "Shall man be more just than God? shall mortal man be more pure than his Maker?" Everything else is withheld, as though until this is firmly established in the soul, the doctrine of a spirit-life may be, in itself, morally powerless, and even unfavorable to a true piety.

from care and toil, where tempest never comes, nor rain nor snow invade, but evermore sweet-breathing gales of Zephyrus refresh the souls of men." Hesiod gives the same picture, *Works and Days*, 154; and adds to it, as a then current mythology, the conception of "The Isles of the Blessed."

ἐν μακάρων νήσοισιν ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες.

Of which Pindar, not long afterwards, gives such a glowing description, Olymp. II. 110* (BOECKH): "Where the sun is ever shining, where the souls of the just spend a tearless eternity, ἄδακρυν νέμονται αἰῶνα (or a tearless existence); whilst those of a still higher degree "Take the way of Jove that leads to Saturn's tower, where Ocean's gales breathe round the isles of the blessed, where flowers of gold and fruits immortal grow." In comparison with this, how poor, as some would estimate it, is the dark, shadowy, unlocalized, and wholly indefinite conception of the Old Testament writers, if it can be called a conception at all.

Greater Moral Power of this Old Testament Reserve. Its connection with a Pure Theism.

To a true theological insight, however, there are two thoughts which must reverse the scale, and lead to a very different conclusion. In the first place, there is in this Greek picture but the dimmest idea of God (if there is any such, except in the local designations where divine names seem to be employed), or of any divine righteousness. It is such a view as might be entertained by a writer, who, in another place, PIND., Nem. vi. 1, makes us all the children of nature, gods as well as men. The second thought is its utter lack of moral power. We feel this as we read, and find it confirmed by the fact of the little influence the Greek Hadean conception actually had upon their moral or religious life. In the Hebrew conception, as held by the pious mind, the idea of God, so prominent, so controlling, more than makes up for its dimness, and more than fills out all its scenic or local deficiency. "THOU wilt show me the way of life;" "O that Thou wouldst lay me up in Hades," Job xiv.; "Thou wilt call, and I will answer; Thou wilt have regard to the work of Thy hands." To say nothing now of such a triumphant outburst as we have, Job xix. 25, "I know that my Redeemer liveth;" or such clear hopes as are expressed, Ps. xvii. 15, "I shall behold *Thy* face in righteousness; I shall be *satisfied* when I awake, *Thy* likeness;" the comparison might be rested on one of the briefest declarations of Scripture, in which death is contemplated as a going to God, and the whole idea of immortality is reduced to a single trust in some undefined blessedness. As Psalm xxxi. 6: בידך אפקיד רוחי, "Into THY hands do I commit my spirit; THOU hast redeemed me; Lord, God of *truth*." It matters but little whether we regard this declaration as made *in extremis*, or in view of some great danger. It is, in either view, the committing of the whole being unto God, as something *belonging* to Him, in virtue of an eternal relation, expressed by the word, פדיתה אותי, "Thou hast redeemed me," and the covenant idea appearing in אֱמֶת, which ever means *truth*, as *trust* or faithfulness, or truth in its *personal* rather than in its *abstract* or speculative aspect. "Into *Thy* hands;" that is all; but how immensely does it transcend in moral power—in "the power of an endless life,"—all those Homeric, Hesiodean, and Pindaric pictures which some would regard as so rich in comparison with the Hebrew poverty.

Comparison of the Early Hindu and Shemitic Belief. Merx' Claim of Superiority for the former.

This lack of a true moral and theological insight is strikingly, though unwittingly, shown by MERX (*Das Gedicht von Hiob.*, p. x.), where, in respect to this belief in another life, he asserts the superiority of the Vedas to the Bible. "In the representations of such an existence after death," he proceeds to say, "there is a deep difference between the people

* It may be said, too, that in this passage of Pindar there is fully developed the other idea, or the doom of the wicked. See line 120.

Τοὶ δ' ἀπροσόρατον ὀκχέοντι πόνον.

A woe on which no eye can gaze.

of *our* race (the Arian) and the Shemitic. The latter know no Isles of the blest, where the noble heroes live. All that is included in that word *hero* seems to them a reckless audacity. The old *men* of *renown* (בני שם, or men of name), appear to them as impudent evil doers. The Semites, in consequence of living with their herds in the plains, and shunning the mountain peaks, fail in the development of the loftier energies. It was otherwise with our ancestral kindred, as we learn from the monuments of their religion. It is true that, in the Vedas, allusions to a life after death do not often occur. They had too much to do with the present world. Still, as a reward for piety, there was held to be admission to the abodes of the Heavenly Powers." As a proof of the superiority of the Hindu to the Shemitic belief in this respect, he gives us passages from the *Rigveda*, ix. 113, 7–11, in the rhythmical version of Prof. Roth.

Da, wo der Schimmer nie erlöscht,
Zur Welt des Sonnenlichtes hin,
Der ewigen unsterblichen—
Dahin, O Soma, bringe mich.

Wo König ist Vivaswant's Sohn,
Und wo des Himmels Innerstes,
Wo jene Wasserquellen sind,
Dort lasse mich unsterblich sein!

Wo man behaglich sich ergeht,
Im dritten hohen Himmelsraum,
Wo Schimmer alle Räume füllt
Dort lasse mich unsterblich sein!

Wo Wunsch und Wohlgefallen ist,
Die Höh', zu der die Sonne klimmt
Wo Lust ist und Befriedigung,
Dort lasse mich unsterblich sein:

Wo Freuden und Ergötzungen,
Wo jubelndes Entzücken wohnt,
Wo sich ein jeder Wunsch erfüllt,
Dort lasse mich unsterblich sein.

Other extracts are made, and of a similar kind. There is a striking sameness in their imagery—all joy and glitter. The first thought that occurs is a doubt whether a writing containing such ideas, and so expressed, can really be regarded as very ancient. There is something about this Epicurean Heaven so full of sunshine,* with such a glee, as it were, arising from the immediate gratification of every desire, and the instantaneous fulfilment of every wish, that is inconsistent with the gravity, the awed contemplative spirit, and solemn reticence of great antiquity. The second thought is its destitution of moral power. It is a mere picture of what is held best on earth, transferred to a supposed higher sphere. It is a pure poetic fancy, the product of the Brahminic imagination, artistic and artificial. It was never inspired in the highest sense. It was not born in any soul travail, nor nursed by the contemplation of any holy or divine idea. God is not in it as the chief and controlling thought. Its heaven is not made by His presence. The mind that dreamed it was not wholly atheistical, but it had nc such conception as that of a covenant God and Redeemer, educating men in their first lesson of immortality through the ideas inseparable from such a relation. In other words, these Vedaic, Homeric, and Pindaric fancies, so extolled above the dim Hebraic conceptions, were lacking in that element to which we have so repeatedly alluded, *δύναμις ζωῆς ἀκατάλυτου*, "the power of an endless life," of a *being* indissoluble, because of its

* The resemblance to the Odyss., iv. 565, vi. 42, and especially to the latter passage, is very striking. A close comparison strongly favors the conclusion that the lines of the Veda, if the translation be correct, must have been, in some way, drawn from these of Homer; a supposition not extravagant, if we suppose them later than Alexander's expedition, and the knowledge that may, perhaps, have come into India from that source.

Wo Schimmer alle Räume füllt,
——ἀλλὰ μαλ' αἴθρη
πέπταται ἀνέφελος, λευκὴ δ' ἐπιδέδρομεν αἴγλη.

connection with the divine. The Vedaic theology, even in its pantheistic mysticism, has no true recognition of this. To its outward, or Epicurean picture, it is wholly lacking. It knows nothing of the αἰώνιος ζωή of the Scriptures, or the true immortality. The sonorous refrain—

Dort lasse mich unsterblich sein,

carries with it no higher conception than that of mere *undyingness*. It is but a *living on* in some way differing from the present simply by a higher joyousness, in some higher locality, whether above the Himalaya, or on the summits of Olympus, or even in the skies themselves, with the gods as merely a higher class of companions. The Scriptures were intended for a higher education than this, and hence their very silence is ofttimes more expressive, more suggestive of ideas that are full of life than the most positive language of other ancient writings. "O that I knew where I might find Him." How poor this groping, sighing despair, it may be said, in comparison with the rapture which Merx gives us as a specimen of the higher and clearer ideas of our Arian kinsmen! But Job's darkness is better than its light. The subdued trust of the Psalmist is better than its vain soaring: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the death-shade (the *terra umbrarum*, see Job x. 21, xxxviii. 17), I will fear no evil; for THOU art with me." Sombre as are the thoughts suggested by the Hebrew *Tzalmaveth*, the idea of the redeeming Presence gives it a glory transcending all the sunlight, all the shimmer, and sparkle of the Vedaic hymn.

Merx proceeds farther with this contrast, attempting to sustain it by reference to the modes of burial or burning that arose from the different views entertained of death. In every thing of the kind the superiority is assigned to the Arian races. The translation of Enoch had been regarded as an early intimation of a higher life with God, to which one was taken who had "walked with God" on earth. But the contemned Shemites must be robbed even of this. "How widely different," says Merx, that is, how inferior, "were the views of the Hebrews, of whom we must not judge from any thing in the *Enoch legend* (*der Henochsage*), since the Hebrew origin of it is more than doubtful."* It is certainly a curious phase of "the higher criticism," as it calls itself, this constant tendency to depreciate the Shemitic Scriptures, whilst never allowing a doubt as to the antiquity or value of any thing, however poor its supporting testimony, that they may choose to place in contrast with them.

Moral Danger in separating the Idea of a Future Life from a Pure Theism. Modern Spiritualism and Modern Science.

Still the fact remains a very strange one, especially as judged by the ordinary criticism, that in this peculiar Shemitic race, and at this very early day, there should have been such a deep religiousness, such a lofty piety, and yet with a conception of a future life so very dim, if it existed at all. We wonder most to find it so deeply veiled in this Book of Job, where the clearer view seems so greatly needed. The divine wisdom, however, in such a veiling, such a reserve, will be the more readily seen and acknowledged, when we think of the wild fables and mischievous notions to which the unguarded Hadean doctrine gave rise among other peoples of antiquity, and especially as it became more and more dissevered from any regulating divine idea. Of this we have already spoken. It remains to say that in our own times we find a still more striking proof of the moral danger of such a severance. The modern "spiritualism," as it calls itself, would be unworthy of grave notice here, were it not as a manifestation of such a tendency. It is becoming almost wholly

* "*More than doubtful.*" What knowledge has he enabling him to make so nice an estimate? The reason given is that "Enoch is representative of the departed year gone to the *Ewigkeit*." We may see by this what rapid progress Rationalism sometimes makes. What Ewald hazarded as a mere conjecture, founded on nothing stronger than the coincidence (very remarkable among so many stated numbers!) of Enoch's age with the number of days in the year, Merx treats as a settled point, which none now would think of calling in question. Nothing, however, is more improbable. Those very "wise Egyptians," as late as the time of Herodotus, had not yet determined the year by five days, still treating it, in some respects, as 360, and yet these critics would have it not only settled in the days of Enoch, but so well settled as to make a myth out of it. Then, again, it would be a mere sentimentalism, suiting well in modern times, but inconsistent with a great antiquity.

naturalistic, and even atheistical. Its continual babble about natural laws shows its strong desire to keep out, as far as possible, the ideas of God and moral causation. The same may be said in respect to some aspects of modern science. How strong the aversion which is manifested, in certain quarters, to the idea of a personal God, with its necessarily associated ideas of Providence and Prayer! They interfere with the doctrine of fixed evolution, or of uninterrupted physical causation. And yet it is most worthy of note, that there is no such aversion to the mere idea of a post-mortem existence. Some who have gone to the very verge of atheism have expressed a willingness to patronize the other dogma, provided it can be presented in some scientific form. Separate it from the thought of God, or of any dread moral government; reduce it to a mere physical fact, and there need be no objection to it. There is nothing in the way. The theories of the *origin* of life, as held by many, are quite consistent with its *continuance* in some finer organization, or in some higher physical development.

Atheism and Materialism not Inconsistent with some Doctrine of Future Being.

In this way, the most crass materialism may have its future state, possessing, perhaps, a memory of the former; since memory and consciousness are merely the results of organization, and may thus be carried through from one to the other. Even atheism cannot wholly shut out the idea, or the phantom, if it would. It may have a ghostly world of the future, even as it makes a ghost of the present. It may have its spectres and its demons, all the product of natural laws, even if it has no God. It cannot escape the thought of the fearful by denying the existence of any power above nature. Who knows what forms of being such an omnipotent and eternal nature may produce? And who can say that they may not be inconceivably dire and monstrous? If one says, that cannot be so,—there must be something in the universe, as a whole, which prevents the predominance of what we call evil, whether physical or moral—the question at once arises, how does he know *that* from any science, with its infinitesimal experience? He is unconsciously taking refuge in a higher doctrine, or borrowing ideas from the contemned theological sphere of thought. Even the Democritic, or the Atomic philosophy, whether in its most ancient or its most modern form, may have its future state. Among the endless phenomena of the physical universe, man may re-appear; the very same man, so far as there can be any such thing as personal identity. Given infinite time, and infinite space, and infinite variety, of working, and the atoms which compose his brain may come together in the same proportion, site, and arrangement as before. When this takes place, there he is again, with the same feelings, thoughts, knowledge, memory, consciousness, — all being, as before, simply the results of that peculiar material organization which alone makes him what he *is*. The idea of another life after death is not, in itself, an absolute essential of religion; since, as Genesis and this Book of Job most clearly prove, there may be even a lofty piety where there is only the dimmest conception of such a state. In its perversion, on the other hand, it may even become the ally of irreligion. Severed from the divine idea, it may be the parent of the most monstrous superstitions, or link itself with some gross doctrine of a physical metempsychosis—becoming, in either case, a more evil thing than the densest skepticism.

A PURE THEISM TO BE FIRST TAUGHT.

The Great Lesson of the Book—The Absolute Sovereignty of God.

The distinctions made in the preceding pages have been the more largely dwelt upon as furnishing a reason, we may reverently suppose, why, in the early revelation, this doctrine of a future life is kept so much under the veil. It is that the other and the diviner doctrine may be the more fully learned, and firmly fixed in the human mind, as the conservative principle, the purifying power of all other religious beliefs. The subordinate idea, as we have said, is not wholly excluded from the Book of Job. It now and then appears amid the darkness; but there is made no use of it in enforcing the great lesson, which is, to teach the absolute moral sovereignty of God, and the unqualified duty of

human submission, as to a demand carrying in itself its own inherent righteousness. The theism, the theodicé of the Book is its great feature. Never were the divine personality, the divine holiness, the divine government unchallengeable, in a word, the absolute divine sovereignty, more sublimely set forth. Here there is no reserve: God most wise and good, most just and holy, to be acknowledged as such whether we can see it or not; God who "maketh one vessel to honor and another to dishonor," who "setteth on high or casteth down," who "bindeth up or breaketh in pieces," who is to be regarded as having the holiest reasons for all this, yet "giveth no account of His ways," allowing "no one to touch His hand, and say unto Him what doest Thou?"

Not the Solution of a Problem—Not a Doctrine of Compensation.

Such is the lesson taught. This is the *problem* solved, if we may use the language most commonly employed in reference to the Book. We do not, however, regard it as the best. The idea that the poem, or drama, of Job is intended for the solution of a *problem*, or as the authoritative decision of a debate, has led astray, we think, from a right view of its true character. There is no objection to the word, if it is used simply as a name for the great lesson undoubtedly taught, and which Job so thoroughly learned, namely,—this holy divine sovereignty,—but when we attempt to specify any other issue regarded as involved in the arguments of the speakers, and as finally decided by the divine appearing, we fall into endless confusion, as is evinced by the number of varying and discordant theories to which such a view of the Book has given rise. The design certainly cannot be to teach a future state. What has been already said is sufficient in respect to that point. Neither can it be to prepare the way for such a doctrine by furnishing representations which drive to its necessary acknowledgment as the only solution of the alleged problem.* The hope of compensation such views might seem to involve would be out of harmony with that other and greater acknowledgment which Job at last makes so unreservedly, and some idea of which seems to pervade the Book from beginning to end. In respect to all such ideas of compensation, whether in this life or in any other, it is sufficient to say that no mention is made of them in the divine address, whatever may have been the subsequent fact; they are not assigned as having any bearing upon Job's affliction, or as clearing up, in any way, the mystery that surrounds it. The same may be said in regard to any disciplinary purpose, on which Elihu so largely insists. The divine voice makes no allusion to it. The criminations of his friends, Job's assertions of his integrity (in those most eloquent concluding appeals of chapters xxix., xxx., xxxi.), and Elihu's "pretentious wisdom," as some have characterized it, are all dismissed as being, so far as the great mystery is concerned, but a "darkening of counsel by words without knowledge."

VARIOUS VIEWS OF THE BOOK.

Delitzsch, Merx, Umbreit, etc.

"Why do afflictions befall the righteous man?" "This," says Delitzsch, "is the question, the answering of which is made the theme of the Book of Job." "This answer," he proceeds, "if we look at the conclusion of the Book alone, is, that such afflictions are the way to a two-fold blessedness." The first of these is the restoration of the earthly good of which he had been deprived. This, however, Delitzsch pronounces inadequate as a solution, and not, in general, true. The second is the internal blessedness which the righteous man finds through such a process. "It is the important truth," he says, "that there is a suffering of the righteous which is not a decree of wrath, but a dispensation of love, and this is the heart of the Book of Job." To this general view he gives two divisions: 1. The afflictions of the righteous are a means of discipline and purification; 2. They

* According to this view, it would be *tentative* and skeptical,—we mean skeptical in a good sense,—like some of the Socratic discourses, which are thus entitled, because they come to no conclusion, yet have served a good purpose in teaching us our ignorance, or by showing the great value of the truth sought, and stimulating to more earnest study to be rewarded by the disclosures of a more advanced revelation.

are proofs and tests of character coming from the love and regard of God. In short, "they are disciplinary and they are testing." All this may be admitted as, in some way, taught in the Book, or truly suggested by it. So, also, there are other theories presented in various ways by other writers, but all coming to nearly the same thing. Some express themselves with more freedom in respect to the question of fact, whether the Book really furnishes the solution it seems to propose. Merx, the latest interpreter, does not hesitate to pronounce it a failure. After saying much of the Vergeltungslehre of the Mosaic religion, and of the Old Testament generally, and of this Book as being polemically opposed to such a doctrine of retribution—all of which Delitzsch justly estimates as "a phantom of the Rationalists"—he goes on to speak, in the highest terms, of the artistic excellence of the work, patronizing it even to extravagance, but does not shrink from saying that the solution it proposes is not only inadequate but false. The great problem is still unsolved, and the writer intimates that it all comes from the fact that the author of the Book was ignorant of "the Critical Philosophy." "Of this," says Merx, with more naïveness than he ascribes to the old poet, "he does not seem to have had the faintest notion." How the Critical Philosophy would have saved the difficulty, or rather would have shown it to be wholly imaginary, he endeavors to tell us, but it seems far less clear than the Book of Job itself, and may be dismissed with the same sentence of failure and inadequateness. Still the objections made by such commentators as Umbreit and Merx have much force in them as applied to many of the so-called solutions. A stronger objection to some of them is that they receive no countenance from the prologue, or from the address of Jehovah at the close,—where, if anywhere, such a clear solution of the problem might have been expected.

Key in the Prologue—A Super-earthly Probation.

If we are to judge it solely as an artistic production, then the plan and design of it are to be sought in the prose introduction, just as we look there for the design of a Greek drama, — and this without any nice discussion of the unimportant question, whether the book is to be called dramatic, any more than lyrical or epic. Here is a preface with the evident design of explaining what the mere poem might leave unknown, and without which, as has been tersely said, the dramatic speeches would be artistically a mere torso,—a trunk without a head. In this introduction we do find something which, in the absence of other considerations, we should be required to take as the leading idea of the work. It is, that there are reasons for human events, even for the sufferings of good men, that may wholly transcend this earthly sphere, having no reference to any human probation, *for its own sake*, either by way of discipline or retribution, but designed to serve a purpose in the super-human world. It is a problem for the בני אלהים the Sons of God, one in which they are interested, by which they are to be influenced, but in which a man is the sufferer, the testing patient through whom the truth is exhibited. Thus, earth may be the theatrum in which dramatic events are represented for the instruction of higher beings. It may be to show them that there is such a thing as human virtue, that man immersed in nature, and exposed to the strongest temptations, may "serve God for nought," that is, disinterestedly, or from pure love of the service; as Job did, both in his prosperity and in his perfect submission, at last, to a dispensation unexplained and inexplicable. Such a thought seems plainly in the prologue; but be it what it may, there is a conceivable design of this kind sufficiently great and beneficent to justify the ways of God, even to our reason, without any demand of compensation to the one by whom the example or the test is made,—especially in view of the fact that such a demand, or even such an expectation, would be the most direct proof of its failure.*

* Some such thought of a superearthly drama appears in what the Apostle says, Eph. iii. 10: "That now through the Church there might be made known to the Principalities and Powers in the Heavenly World (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις), the manifold (πολυποίκιλος, *immensely varied*) wisdom of God." See Olshausen on the text: "The Church (good men on earth, whether in their piety or their sufferings) is the *theatre* (*seiner Wirksamkeit*) through which this manifold wisdom and teaching are made known to the angels." In support of the idea, Olshausen very properly cites 1 Pet. i. 12: εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι: "Which things the angels desire to look into" (to bend eagerly forward for that purpose) and Paul's language, 1 Cor. iv. 9: θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κοσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις.

The Lesson of Unqualified Submission.

The design *may* be discipline or punishment, having reference solely to the individual. All that need to be maintained is, that it is not necessarily such. They may be admitted as subordinate aims, in connection with something higher and more universal. As thus subordinate, they may even become prominent in the dramatic teaching, as seems to be the case in Job, and yet without furnishing the idea, or the grounds, of the great lesson. Or it may be the design, aside from these, or in connection with these, to teach the lesson of absolute and unconditional submission to the divine will, and an acknowledgment of its necessary wisdom and goodness, whether we see it or not, either in the present or in any other life. This is quite different from a stoical fatality, or from any mere arbitrariness. It is not that the divine will *makes right*, but that it constitutes for us an evidence of its absolute righteousness that is not to be called in question. The *because*, we may say, has reference to our judgments. He does it *because* it is absolutely right in itself; we say it is right (in the absence of other knowledge) *because* He does it. As the Psalmist says, xxxix. 10: "I was dumb, I opened not my mouth, because Thou didst it." It is a theism inadequate, impure, tainted by some ideas of fatality, or of a power higher than God, that hesitates in making this full and absolute affirmation. The reasons of the divine procedure in any particular case may be wholly or partially hidden. They may have reference to the individual experience, discipline, or purgation of the sufferer, and yet be wholly unknown to him. Job vehemently asserts his innocence. There is something noble in his expostulations; it was not a vain display of self-righteousness; he was driven to it by unjust criminations; and yet there might have been hidden evils whose existence his inexplicable sufferings should have led him to suspect, aside from the question whether they were, or were not, the sole cause of the calamities which had come upon him. He should have searched for them as the Psalmist did, and prayed for self-knowledge. His earnest appeal to God: "O show me wherefore Thou thus dealest with me," is indeed very touching, but it manifests too serene a confidence in his entire integrity. It is not like the prayer of David: "Cleanse Thou me from secret faults;" or of him who said: "Make me to know wisdom in the inward parts;" or of the later exile, who so fervently prayed: "Search me, O God, and know my heart; prove me, and know my thoughts, and see if there be any evil way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting." If it be said that Job was very defective here as compared with some others of the Old Testament worthies, it may be urged, on his behalf, that the accusations of his friends, charging him with open transgressions of which he knew he was not guilty, led him away into a mode of defence just in respect to them, but not maintainable before the All-knowing, as he himself afterwards most clearly saw.

Reasons Transcending Human Knowledge.

But aside from this, or along with this disciplinary purpose, there may have been other reasons belonging to the ἄῤῥητα, the ineffable, the mysterious, transcending, perhaps, the human faculties, but which he was bound to admit as possible, however much he or others might fail in finding an explanation of the severe trial to which he had been exposed. "He giveth not account of his ways." Such a view may be characterized as harsh and arbitrary, but it is perfectly consistent with the highest estimate of the Divine clemency. "God knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust." He hath pity upon man. Even the thought of his depravity, the fact that "the imagination of the heart of man is evil from his youth," is mentioned (Gen. ix. 21) as one of the grounds of the divine compassion. But he knoweth, too—are we not warranted, from the tenor of revelation, in saying it—that the loftiest height to which the human soul can attain, and ultimately its highest blessedness, is the acknowledgment of God's absolute *right*, as the acknowledgment of His absolute *glory!* It is that to which the human soul of the Saviour attained when, in the great struggle with Satan, in the mysterious and inexplicable agony, he said, "Thy will be done."

The Absolute Divine Sovereignty before any Doctrine of Human Destiny.

Thus regarded, the value of a pure theism, in which the absolute divine sovereignty holds its sovereign place, is beyond that of every other dogma.* Without it, all other religious teaching may become not only vain but mischievous. Without it, the doctrine of a future life may become the source of the greatest moral evils, leading, at last, to atheism, after having been the ally of the grossest superstitions. On this account, may we say again, was there need of a reserve that might hold in check the roving imagination,—of a veil, not wholly obscuring, but allowing only the faintest glimpses, now and then, to keep the soul from utterly sinking. Such a schooling of the chosen people, as the world's representatives, was demanded, we may say, until the other great and conserving truth should be perfectly learned, and indelibly stamped upon the soul. Far better a dim shadowy belief in a future life, or a mere feeling without any distinct conception of state or locality, or resolving itself into a pure elementary trust in a covenant God,—far better this than an unrestrained imaginative picturing, destitute of all true moral power, and to which the thought of God, as a moral sovereign, is, in a great measure, alien, if not wholly lost. Far better the old patriarchal and Hebrew reserve in this respect than such a Hades, and such an Elysium, as we read of in the Greek poets, or any such rhapsodies as the Rationalist so triumphantly quotes for us from the Rigveda. Among the many other solutions, then, of the Book of Job, this seems certainly entitled to respectful attention. It is the teaching of such a theism, whilst throwing into the back-ground, to say the least, not only the dogma of a future life, but every thought of compensation,† discipline, or anything else, that might interfere with the absolute unconditionality of the greater doctrine.

THE THEOPHANY.

Its One Idea: The Divine Omnipotence. God "can do All Things."

If the solution of the problem, as some call it, is to be found anywhere, it is in the address of the Almighty. That is what every reader naturally expects, and is disappointed, to some extent, in not finding. No explanation, however, is given of the cause of Job's mysterious sufferings, nor any decision made in regard to the matters in debate between him and his antagonists. Instead of that, one idea, predominant and exclusive, pervades every part of that most sublime exhibition. It is that of power, omnipotent power, first as exhibited in the great works of creation,‡ and afterwards in those greater productions of nature that

* It is not too much to say that even now, in this advanced age of theology, there is arising a new need of this idea. There is something in the naturalistic tendencies of our science, and our literature, which more and more demands a revival of the thought of a personal, holy, omnipotent, unchallengeable God, who "doeth all things according to His good pleasure," whether through nature, or against nature, or above nature. The sharpening of this would give a new edge to every other religious dogma. The ideas of sin, holiness, accountability, would receive a new impress of clearness and power. The doctrine of a future life would get a moral significance, throwing in the back-ground those naturalistic and merely imaginative features which are now making it a matter of curious speculation, or of physical, rather than of ethical interest. Such a sudden sharpening of the divine idea would have a startling effect, like the actual witnessing of a miracle, in bringing so near the thought of God as to set it in a new and surprising light, resembling vision rather than theory, and calling forth something like the exclamation of Job, when "the hearing of the ear" had become an actual beholding.

† As matter of outward fact, indeed, there is set forth in the close of the drama a full compensation. It forms, what some, who are fond of the more artistic criticism, call "the outer disentanglement," or *Die Lösung in äusserer Wirklichkeit;* but we are nowhere told that this entered into the idea of the poem. As such, it would be inconsistent with the thought so prominent in the prologue, or the possibility of a man's serving God for nought. As a mere outward scene, however, it has a certain appropriateness, like the matter-of-fact close of a Greek drama, sometimes brought in as a satisfaction to the reader, to save him from pain, by making a harmony in the outward narrative. But in Job the great lesson is complete without it. We read it with pleasure, as something simply due to dramatic consistency, that when the spiritual drama is over, the hero, as the Rationalists, with some propriety, call him, may not be left in his state of suffering; but the great inward design is concluded by the submission of Job, which would have been utterly spoiled by the intimation of any expected recompense. The apparent design, too, of the prologue is satisfied without it. When Job submits, Satan is baffled, and God's judgment is true.

‡ It is worthy of note how the appeal is made alike to the great natural and the great supe-natural, as though the

seem next in rank to the creative power itself. Nothing is said of any purpose in the great trial, or of anything which should be made known to Job as preparatory to his submission. There is no hint in respect to ultimate compensation as a motive for endurance, such as is held out in the Gospel to the Christian: "They that endure unto the end, shall be saved." There is no allusion to any scheme of discipline, no suggestion of afflictions which are only evils apparently, since they are designed for purification, or as a preparative for a higher blessedness. The curtain is not withdrawn to disclose to us any vision of optimism as a motive for the creature's submission. Nothing of this kind appears, but only that idea of power, omnipotent power, thundered forth in tones that seem intended to silence rather than to convince. However strange it may seem, this is all the voice we hear, startling and confounding at first, but soon causing us to forget everything in a feeling of its sublime appropriateness: "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?" What knowest thou of the divine purposes in thy own creation, or in that of the universe? What right, therefore, hast thou to challenge any of them as unrighteous or unwise, much less to dream of any fatality, or of any nature of things by which they might be baffled, whether they be purposes of justice or of clemency? It would seem as though its only design was to overwhelm, and it is overwhelming. Job falls upon his face and acknowledges that he has learned the lesson. It is not mere terror. Deep is the reverence; but there is also the conviction of the understanding and the conscience: "I *know* that Thou canst do all things, and that no purpose* of Thine can be hindered." Had he doubted it before? It would certainly seem so, whether at the time he had been fully conscious of it or not.

The Old Idea of Fate—The Name El Shaddai as Opposed to it.

A feeling of something irresistible in the vast surrounding nature, something with which it is vain for man to struggle, and against which not even a divine power could help him, shows itself, more or less, in all the early heathen religions, as it appears afterwards in the systems of philosophy. They called it fate, *μοῖρα*, doom, destiny. It was superior to gods as well as to men. It was irrational, inconsistent with any true theistic conception, but its ever-pressing nearness, as well as the vastness and indefinableness of its aspect, gave it an overpowering weight. That some feeling of this kind, some beginning of a fatalistic idea, may have been in the minds of God's people, tainting even the otherwise pure theism of the patriarchs, would seem probable from the stress laid upon that assuring epithet, אל שדי, occurring so often in Genesis and Job, and furnishing such strong evidence of the antiquity of the latter Book. "Almighty God," אל שדי, *Deus potentissimus, omnipotens, παντοκράτωρ*, the strong God, *Deus sufficiens*, אשר לא יבצר ממנו מאומה, "from whom nothing can be hindered," to whom nothing can fail—this was the great name of strength and encouragement which God Himself employs to cheer the hearts of those early men, and keep them from fainting in their pilgrimage: אני אל שדי, "I am *El Shaddai*, therefore, fear ye not, but walk before me." Thus regarded, too, much of the language of the Old Testament respecting the divine power, the divine sovereignty, and the extreme jealousy that guards against the least impeachment of these attributes, loses all its seeming harshness. Like the denunciations of idolatry, it is conservative of pure religion. It is a protest against the nature-worship, the fatalistic ideas that were everywhere coming in to pervert the true theistic conception. Thus viewed,

distinction had not then been made; or the line drawn, as in our modern thinking; or as though to the Divine Mind such a distinction was of no account. Nature and law are clearly recognized in the Bible; but both departments, the natural and the supernatural, are regarded as equally illustrating the power and greatness of God as manifested in all. The same may be said of the appeal to the great animal creations, surpassing man in strength and magnitude. It is not to show design, or utilitarian ends, as in our modern natural theology, and hence to demonstrate the existence of a Deity. Job is not addressed as doubting that, or as needing any proof of God's wisdom and goodness. Everything, on the other hand, bears upon this one idea of omnipotence. It is to show that God "can do all things"—a truth which Job confesses (xlii. 2), in language intimating that he had not before fully realized it.

* Literally, "hindered from Thee." בצר has its Syriac sense of diminution, restraint, failure. LXX. *ἀδυνατεῖ δέ σοι οὐδέν.* The Syriac has "nothing can be hidden from Thee," and in this it resembles our common version. Dr. Conant's is better: "And from Thee no purpose can be withheld;" but fails, we think, in giving the full thought, which is that of insufficiency, or want of power in the execution.

it is the language of paternal Deity, encouraging to faith and submission as the only blessedness of the human state: "Fear not, for I can do all things."

The Fatalistic Idea betrays Itself in the Speeches of Job and his Friends.

Such a misgiving dread of some insurmountable fatality, putting his case beyond the reach even of any divine help, seems to lurk in the speeches of Job at the times of his extremest despair. The friends were not pressed to it, as he was, by an anguish unendurable. They had not his experience to breed a doubt. Free from pain and trouble, they could theorize complacently on the divine excellencies, "speaking good words for God," as Job taunts them, and expatiating at their ease on this attribute of omnipotence. Here the speeches of Zophar and Bildad are peculiarly eloquent, however ill-timed. Job, too, is roused to emulation, and strives to surpass them (see especially chs. xxv. and xxvi.). And yet this very style of speech seems, now and then, to betray a want of the confidence it so loudly assumes. The speaker seems to indulge in it as a mode of fortifying himself in a faith not wholly free from a lurking skepticism. None of them, however, ever intimated a doubt of the justice and wisdom of God. In his extreme anguish, Job may seem to be approaching some thought of the kind, but immediately revolts from it, as from the edge of an abyss. He cannot give it up: God is good; He is righteous; He is most pure and holy; but may it not be that there is something, be it fate, be it nature, be it an invisible, fiendish* power, that baffles all His mercy and all His wisdom. "The earth is given into the hands of the wicked," ix. 24; is this the work, or the permission, or the weakness of God? אם לא אפו מי הוא, "if not, who then?" Would there be such sore evils? Above all, would they come upon the innocent, if he could help it? Is there not a nature, a fixed order of things (as Job, according to Merx, would have said, had he understood "the Critical Philosophy," or the distinction between "the moral and the practical reason,") which cannot be set aside?

The Divine Address adapted to this Fatalistic Idea.—Job's Renunciation of it.

He has not ventured to say it openly in words; the very thought seemed to demand repression whenever it showed itself, however dimly, to the consciousness. It was *there*, however, as is shown by the language of the divine address so directly adapted to such a state of soul, and the closing acknowledgment of Job, expressing a new and clear conviction that admits no doubt. It is absolute certainty, — the certainty of sight, as compared with any abstract theorizing, or any traditional "hearing by the ear:" I *know*,"—it is like the ecstatic assurance he had of his Redeemer's living—"I *know*† that Thou canst do *all things;* and

* There is language in chapter xvi. from which it would seem that Job had such beings in view, — a multitude of them, in fact, as well as the great enemy mentioned in the prologue. Such expressions as those in verses 9 and 10, of that chapter, can hardly be used of the three friends: "His anger rends me; he lies in wait for me (ישטמני, cognate with שטן, Satan); he gnashes on me with his teeth; mine enemy (צרי), sharpens his eyes upon me (glares at me); they gape upon me with their mouths" (פערו, like the yawning Orcus, Is. v. 14). We are shocked at the very thought of such words being applied to God, although most of the commentators have so taken them. The language that follows: "God delivers me up," *etc.*, though strong, is in a different style; simply presenting the idea of an unjust surrender into Satan's hands. It might be said, too, that the absence of any expressed subject (simply implied, *he*, *they*, *etc.*) is evidence of something fearful in the thought, as in the cases mentioned, note, p. 7. The referring them to God, would be inconsistent, moreover, with the appeal to the Witness on high, ver. 20. The language of vers. 9 and 10 shows an imagination wildly excited, as though at the sight of fiends making hideous faces, scowling, and glaring at him. It would seem strange, too, that Satan should so figure in the prologue, and that afterwards no allusion whatever should be made to him. It would not be artistic, if that, as some say, is the chief character of the book. Is there not an implied reference to this great persecutor and murderer (ἀνθρωποκτόνος, John viii. 44), in the appeal to the Avenger or Redeemer, xix. 25? Raschi speaks very confidently in respect to the language, xvi. 9, as though it could not admit of a doubt: "Satan here is the enemy;" והשטן הוא הצר.

† Merx, the latest commentator on Job, in the short notes he adds to his new text and translations, is very fond of putting the word dogmatic to the renderings, ancient or modern, which he rejects. He means by this to stigmatize them as made in a dogmatic interest, even though sometimes giving the only possible meaning which the Hebrew will admit. He ought to have seen how greatly his own version is affected by that precisely identical kind of interest, which we may call the dogmatic anti-dogmatic. He cannot understand this passage according to the text, and so he does not hesitate to give a different punctuation, allowing him to render it: "*Thou* knowest that Thou canst do all things," an answer which wholly mars the force of Job's appeal. Although it may still be taken as his confession of the great truth, yet the putting it thus in the second person makes it not only a pointless assertion, but seems greatly to change the aspect and spirit of the

that nothing is hindered from Thee." It is as though he had said: Now I am sure of it; if the continuance of my misery is not from Thy want of goodness and mercy, much less is it from Thy lack of power; nothing is too hard for Thee; no nature can baffle Thee; no fate stands in Thy way; no invisible power of evil, however mighty, can prevent Thee from "doing according to Thy sovereign will, either in the armies of heaven, or among the inhabitants of the earth." He bows before this divine utterance as conclusive, not only of its own truth, but in respect to everything in the character and government of God that may have been, either directly or indirectly, called in question. It is Thou then who hast done it, and therefore is it holy, just, and wise. Once shown that it is truly God's act—not nature's, merely, or Satan's—and that, if it had not been such, everything in nature that stood in the way would have been crushed out if necessary,—all else follows to the believing soul. Thou hast done it, therefore, is it right? I ask no farther. "Surely have I uttered what I did not understand; things wonderful," far beyond my knowledge. But, oh! "hear me now; let me speak; let me ask of Thee, and do Thou give me knowledge. By the hearing of the ear had I heard of Thee; but now Thou comest near, and I confess Thee as the Almighty. Wherefore, I reject myself (my arguments), and repent in dust and ashes." There is deep feeling here, as of one who has come to a new view of himself and of his relations to God. It is to be noted, however, that it is not from any disclosure of the causes of his sufferings, nor from any hope held out of their alleviation, but altogether from this thunder voice, the tones of which, however varied in the presentation of the great natural or the great supernatural, ever modulate themselves to this one key of Omnipotent, unchallengeable power.

God the Only Power in the Universe.

Not only no other God, but no other power than God in the universe. Compare Isaiah xliv. 6: "I am the first, and I am the last; beside me there is no God." It reminds us of the oft-repeated Arabic formula, so concise, and yet so full: No God *but* God, which must have entered most significantly into the early religion of the Arabians, as we may judge from its prevailing use in the later Koranic. The Mohammedan fatalism, as it has been called, may sometimes have a superstitious aspect, but, in its pious form, as thus expressed, it is rather a protest against a physical fatalism, or against any other power than God, such as is made here in the challenge of Shaddai, the Almighty. There is not only no other personal Deity, but no power in Nature, or in Fate, or in any *system of things*, that can, for a moment, stand in His way, if the vindication of His holiness, His wisdom, or His goodness, demand its breach, or its removal.

Job's Musing Soliloquy and Confession—Note on the Genuineness of the Elihu Portion.

In this view, we see the force of that musing, wondering language which intervenes, ver. 3, where Job seems, without any reason, to be repeating to himself the words of the Almighty, as though they struck him in a new aspect, or suggested something which he had not thought of before: "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" They seem so strange, that Merx and others, with a lack of critical insight, we think, reject them as an interpolation or a misplacement. As first uttered by Jehovah, we have reason to regard them as most directly applicable to the speech of Elihu, who, although uttering great truths (the soundest ethical doctrine, and approaching the nearest of all the speakers to a solution of the supposed problem), had yet done it in a somewhat pretentious manner. As the last speaker, too, he may be regarded as first noticed in the divine address. It does not militate against this that it is said: "The Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind." There

passage. It would be as though he had said: I submit, I lay my hand upon my mouth, because any other course would be of no avail. Thou knowest, Thyself, that Thou art infinitely strong, and canst do as Thou pleasest; of what use, then, any remonstrance? God knoweth the difficulties and darkness of our minds as well as our bodily frames. We may, therefore, believe that a doubt in respect to His power would be less displeasing to Him than such a captious irreverence. There is a shadow of authority for Merx. The pointing is of the first person, but the closing *yod* is supplied by the Keri. It is the same in this respect as in Ps. cxl. 13, יָדַעְתָּ for יָדַעְתִּי, in full, and in עָשִׂיתָ for עָשִׂיתִי, Ezek. xli. 19. It may be also taken as an Aramaism, as it would doubtless have been called could it have been made to suit a rationalistic purpose.

is nothing in the way of regarding these first words as the briefest allowable notice of the man whose voice had just done sounding,* stopped, as it were, by the sudden interruption, and then followed by the turning, in a different style, to Job the subject of the general answer: "But gird up now thy loins, like a man; I have something to say to thee." In this second appeal, xlii. 3, Job seems to take the language to himself, and yet in a manner which shows that it had not been his first thought. In a sort of dreamy maze, he says over the former words of Jehovah, which had made so deep an impression on his mind: "Who is this? Who is this that darkens counsel by words without knowledge?" Yes; it is I. I am the man; I see it now; I am that man who has uttered what he understood not. It is a still deeper feeling of what he had said before: "Surely I am vile (MERX, *weak—dogmaticé*), what shall I answer Thee? I lay my hand upon my mouth. Once, twice have I spoken, but I will not answer. I say no more." "Who is this (dost Thou ask) that darkens counsel by words without knowledge?" To whomsoever else they are applicable, surely they apply to me. In his deep confession and self-abasement, he thinks only of himself and his position in the sight of God. And herein lies the difference between Job and the others. They stand in amazement, it may be, awed by this display of the divine majesty, yet without prostration or confession. Still confident in their own wisdom, they may actually regard these thunder-tones of omnipotence as a decision in their favor, as their vindication, in fact, instead of their rebuke. For had not they, also, all of them, expatiated on this idea of the divine power, to the crushing and humiliation of the trembling Job? The repetition of the words, "*who is this?*" has the appearance of interrupting the train of thought and feeling. On this account, the critic rejects what a closer insight into this rapt, soliloquizing, ejaculatory style,

* The genuineness of the speech of Elihu, which has been much attacked, may be defended on three grounds that, aside from their moral weight, are entitled to attention from those who patronize the Book chiefly on its alleged artistic merits. These are—

1st. That, without it, the appearance and address of Jehovah must be taken as immediately following ch. xxxi., in which case the words, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel," *etc.*, must refer directly to the clearest, most consistent, and most eloquent speech in the Book, namely, Job's noble vindication of his fair life against the damnatory accusations of his friends. It is a most manly appeal, undeserving, we reverently think, of being thus characterized as vain and dark, at least in comparison with those of the others. Besides, the term, עצה, *counsel*, *teaching*, *argument*, cannot be applied to it as it can to the speech of Elihu, which is ostentatiously didactic. Job's appeal, ch. xxxi., is simply a vindicatory statement of fact, in opposition to unrighteous charges. If he is divinely commended for anything, except his last words of submission and repentance, it must be for this noble defence.

2d. The language, "*Who is this, etc.*" would be applicable to much in the general style and spirit of Elihu's discourse. Although the divine answer, as a whole, is addressed to Job, yet nothing would seem more natural than such an incidental reference to the last speaker, who is seemingly interrupted in his eloquence by the sudden rebuke of the supernatural voice. It was a giving counsel, an assumption of wisdom, a claiming "to speak for God;" and although we think that those critics altogether overstrain the matter who charge Elihu with being merely a loquacious babbler, or a vain pretentious disputant, yet, as an attempted vindication of the divine ways, it was a more fit subject for this comparative censure, than the honest and glowing words of Job in ch. xxxi., to which it immediately, or without the least preparation, succeeds, if the part of Elihu is left out. The repetitions of this last speaker, on which some have so much insisted, are of little consequence. They may be blemishes, or rhetorical excellencies, according to the stand-point from which they are viewed. The specimens we have of the old Arabic Seance, or Consessus, show that such a repetitive style of sententious moralizing was held in literary repute. At all events, it is *characteristic*, and this they should regard as a dramatic merit in what they call a "work of art." But, aside from this, there is something in the whole of ch. xxxvii., and especially in the closing verses, to which the language is very applicable, as referring to the last speaker, although the divine address is described, generally, by the historian, as made to Job, to whom, personally, it immediately turns. The words "darkening counsel," *etc.*, denote invalidity of argument, doubtless, but, along with this, they are descriptive of the apparent timidity, abruptness, and awe-struck confusion that seem to characterize the close of Elihu's harrangue. It is the language of one gazing on some strange appearances The emotion and the exclamations thence produced mingle with his didactic utterances, so that he says, ver. 19: "Tell us what we shall say, for we cannot order our speech, by reason of darkness." And this suggests the—

3d Ground, namely, That the whole scene is a *reality*, and that this interlude of Elihu, and especially his abrupt exclamatory closing words, are a convincing evidence of it. It is either a painting from the life, or it is the most consummate art. There is the strongest internal evidence that, during this speech of Elihu, there is represented the approach of the storm-cloud, the rising tornado, interrupting and confusing his words, calling away his attention, and giving rise to broken remarks on the vivid phenomena that accompany it, until he is suddenly silenced by the awful voice. Some of the best commentators have thus regarded the language as referring to an actual coming storm. Delitzsch cites Bridel for the opinion that the thunder, mentioned xxxvii. 1, is not a mere matter of eloquent description, but something actually presented to the senses: "L'éclair brille, la tonnere gronde." It is the language of an eye and ear witness, or if it is a mere work of art — it is so arranged and expressed as to convey that impression So Rosenmüller, in the words of Bouillier: "Inter verba Elihu, dum hæc loqueretur, tonitru exauditum; ad cujus cæcum murmur, mox in fragorem horrendum et fulgur eruptnrum, circumstantes jubet contremiscere." So, also, on the comment on זהב, ver. 22: "Ceterum *splendoris*

shows to be in harmony with the tone and spirit of the scene. The seeming irregularity gives vivid evidence, not only of its artistic, but of its actual scenic truthfulness. It supplies that emotional connection which carries us over all seeming logical or philological breaks.

Job Distinguished from the Others by his Submission.

For what else is Job commended but for the completeness of this submission, with its deep humility and hearty penitence? It would be difficult to find any answer to this, except what has arisen from the theory, very ancient, indeed, and supported by the highest authorities, that the design of the Book, and especially of the theophany at its close, is the decision of a debate, or to determine which party had the better of this long argument about the cause of Job's sufferings. As the traditional view we are reluctant to call it in question, and yet it may be very defective, if not in itself, yet by rejecting or ignoring another which is important as collateral, and, in certain aspects, may be regarded as presenting the predominant lesson. Job is approved not for what he said, or chiefly for what he said, in chs. iii. or xvi., or even in chapters xxviii. and xxxi., but for the few words spoken, xl. 4, xlii. 2–6. This is in accordance with the opinion of Abenezra, the most judicious of the Jewish commentators, who restricts the words of God, xlii. 7: "Ye have not spoken to me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath done," solely to the confession Job had made (xl. 4, xlii. 2–6), and they had not.

---

ex aquilone mentio pertinet ad descriptionem appropinquantis media in tempestate Dei." We find the beginning of this in the close of ch. xxxvi.: "His thunder is announcing Him;" the cattle (מִקְנֶה), feeding on the plains are startled by the ominous noise (xxxvi. 33). Then, immediately (xxxvii. 1), "At this" (אַף לְזֹאת, as though pointing to something coming on and visible to all), "my heart trembles, and leaps out of its place." "Hear, O hear, the roar of His voice, the muttering that proceedeth from His mouth; under the whole heavens He is sending it; His lightning to the far horizon. After it, hark, a sound is roaring (יִשְׁאַג, descriptive future). He is thundering with His majestic voice, and we cannot trace them when that voice is heard." It is all most graphic, calling to mind the speech of Prometheus (ÆSCH. *Prom. Vinct.* 1081) as he goes down in the midst of the storm:

βρυχία δ' ἠχὼ παραμυκᾶται—

how it bellows long and loud. Here, as there, it is the deep baritone thunder reverberating all round the horizon. "There is no *tracking* it (לֹא יְעַקְּבֵם), though the sound is heard." It seems to be everywhere; there is no determining the long roll to any particular quarter of the sky. Then follows a stillness for a time, during which the black סְעָרָה is slowly rising. Again the speaker, though there is an awe upon his soul, attempts to go on with his moralizing on the voice and the marvellous works of God; in all of which he seems more or less influenced by the signs in the heavens as they become more and more startling, or give rise to occasional sudden remarkings upon particular phenomena: "See how He spreads His lightning cloud (CONANT), and turns it with His guidance every way" (v. 12). The tempestuous wind (v. 17), is growing in heat and strength; the intervals of darkness become overpowering; he "cannot order his speech by reason of them." But, lo, a new and startling appearance,—a strange light coming out of the North. He calls it זהב, gold, literally, but here most probably a golden sheen (LXX. νέφη χρυσαυγοῦντα), some electrical or *auroral* light (*aureus, aurum*), suddenly gleaming forth from the Borealic region, or, it may be, lining the edge of the nimbus, as is sometimes the case when it is heavily charged with the electric fluid. "From the North, see, the amber light is coming," comp. Ezek. i. 4 (יאתה, descriptive future). It is this phenomenon, so remarkable and so suddenly arresting the attention of all, that gives the subsequent language its ejaculatory character. There is terror mingled with the glory: "Surely with God there is dreadful majesty." What follows is in the same broken and elliptical style. שדי, "Shaddai, He it is; we cannot find Him out." All through there are those descriptive features indicating something *coming on* of an eventful character. The language becomes more and more that of one subdued in spirit, and awed by the sense of a near divine presence, driving him from his loquacious wisdom: "Great in strength and righteousness; He answers not" (לֹא יְעַנֶּה in Kal, instead of Piel); surely should we fear Him;" that is now more becoming than argument, however seemingly profound; for "He regardeth not the חכמי לב, those who are wise in their own understandings," and presume to judge of His ways.

"Then answered Jehovah from the storm-cloud," הַסְּעָרָה, with the article, the storm-cloud that has been described. As thus viewed in connection with Elihu's speech, and especially the latter part of it, so broken and abrupt, there is a power in the whole representation which compels us to regard it as consummately artistic or, what is still more credible, an actual painting from the life, a real scene from that olden time, and an actual theophany, like those witnessed by Abraham, Moses, and Elijah. On the other hand, cut out the speech of Elihu, or bring the divine address right after ch. xxxi., and we seem to have a hiatus in the drama which all criticism fails to mend.

The remarkable language, v. 22, about "the gold coming from the North (the *Borealic aurora*) may well be compared with Ezek. i. 4: "A storm (סערה) coming f om the North, and a brightness in the circuit, and in the midst of it, כעין החשמל) like the color of brass (*aurichalcum*) Vulg. *quasi species electri.*"

GROUNDS OF JOB'S COMMENDATION.

Origin and Progress of the Dispute.

In order to determine how far such a view may be defended, let us briefly review the general course of the narrative, and of the argument, so far as it can be called by that name.

In the first stages of Job's grievous affliction, he seems to have borne it perfectly. Philosophical stoicism must confess itself immeasurably transcended by such a declaration as is ascribed to Job i. 21: "The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken, blessed be the name of the Lord." What is there in Seneca or Epictetus to compare with this conception of "the old Dichter," as the Rationalists call him? Again, that declaration afterwards made to his tempting wife: "Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?" No language could more clearly and strongly express that idea of unconditional submission on which we have insisted,—that unreserved surrender that asks no questions as to the cause or the issue, makes no demand of compensation, hints at no injustice, seeks for no other reason of its being right than that God hath done it, and that, therefore, it *must* be right. "In all this," it says, "Job sinned not *with his lips*," ii. 10. The latter words in this place —though not occurring in the previous passage, i. 22, where it is said, absolutely, "*Job sinned not*,"—must have a significance. They may denote the beginning of a change, to a degree, perhaps, of which he was yet unconscious. Raschi regards it as a negative pregnant, implying that, though his words were right, there was the beginning of something wrong in his thoughts and feelings; אבל בלבו חטא, "but he sinned in his heart." Below the lips, *ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, in that deep unconscious place lying beneath the thoughts, and out of which, as our Saviour says, thoughts ascend (*ἀναβαίνουσι*), there had been some working of that hidden force which afterwards breaks out so irrepressibly. Another supposition may be indulged, that there had come upon him, or doubtless had greatly increased, that severe bodily anguish which, in its protracted continuance, is so unendurable. Christian martyrs have borne it with divine aid, such as we may suppose Job here not to have had, and because of the briefness of the pain, soon destroying itself, or leading to insensibility. Without this, or when there is no remission or alleviation, it may be safely said that such anguish continuing on, and beyond a certain degree, *cannot be endured.* The man cannot refrain from fiercely crying out, and it matters but little what the language of his cry may be, since it is only, in any sense, a physical expression of this unendurable agony. "He knoweth our frame." God doth not blame Job for this; neither should his friends have blamed him. But this is what they did, and it was the beginning of that wrong direction taken in their subsequent discoursings, and growing more and more devious and confused at every step. They could not put themselves in Job's position. They were astonished at his wild outcries, leading them to imagine something terrible in his state of which they had never thought before. It was this that first led to their chiding tone. They regarded it, not as the involuntary language of extreme suffering, having little of any more accountability attached to it than the mere physical manifestations of tears and groans, but as the evidence of rebellion in the spirit, or of some unknown actual guilt. They had witnessed this during the days of their astonished silence, until they can refrain no longer. His violent language seemed to them like an outburst of profanity; they undoubtedly knew of his fair reputation in the days of his prosperity, corresponding to the character which God Himself gives of His servant. "They had heard of all this evil that had come upon him." Immediately each starts "from his place;" they make an appointment (וַיִּוָּעֲדוּ) "to go and mourn with him, and to comfort him." At the sight of their friend, so changed by suffering that "they knew him not, they wept aloud, and rent their garments, and threw dust upon their heads." In all this there is the deepest sympathy, but no unfavorable judgment.

No Polemical Interest—The Rationalists' Fanciful Vergeltungslehre.

Neither had they any polemical interest against him in maintaining the old Vergeltungslehre, "that phantom of their own imagination," of which the Rationalists are so fond.

There is no evidence that they had come, "each from his place," to dispute with him about that. There is no such doctrine of retribution in the Mosaic Law, as differing from the later Christian, or from the universal experience of the world in either the earliest or the latest times. Always have men believed, and had reason to believe, both truths that impious deeds are often strikingly punished, even in this world, and also that the righteous often suffer in a manner that seems inexplicable. The Rationalists describe their Vergeltungslehre as peculiar to the old Patriarchal and Mosaic times; but there is abundant evidence to the contrary in the narratives of Genesis. Good men are represented as suffering, without any impeachment of their characters, either on the part of God or man, or on the ground of any specific guilt assigned as the cause of it. The lives of Jacob, Joseph, and Moses prove this. So does the whole history of the Israelites in their sore bondage, for which there is no evidence that the immediate sufferers received or expected compensation, and who certainly were not worse, to say the least, than the nations around them, who had none of those severe trials which were sent upon God's chosen people. So far as there was any basis for the idea in the Mosaic institutions, it will generally be found in connection with promises made to families and nations, rather than to individuals. This is the case with the Fifth commandment, which is so often cited in support of this imaginary Vergeltungslehre. Although seemingly addressed to individuals, yet it is in the national aspect that that motive is chiefly held out. It was the nation that was to reap the direct benefit. It was not simply long life, but length of days, continued generations, "*in the land* which the Lord thy God giveth to thee." And so it is in regard to other blessings promised to the Israelites. Their political aspect is everywhere specially predominant, and, in this sense, they ever held most true. The people among whom filial reverence was maintained, as a foundation virtue, along with that deference which a new generation owed to the experience of the elders — such a people would have "length of days;" their institutions would derive a strength and a permanency from such a cause which no other could give. The words "*in the land*," show this. Promises thus made to nations have no such reserve as must be supposed to be connected with them when made, really or apparently, to individuals whose cases are affected by such a multiplicity of outside moral and physical relations. They have no exceptions, expressed or implied, and history would show that, in such a civic sense, they always hold true. The nation has only an earthly being, and this difference was felt, even before the individual after-life was distinctly maintained. The individual virtue stood on a higher platform. It was connected with a higher order of ideas. Though the thought, as a conception, was not dogmatically formed, or consciously received, yet there was in it this mysterious "power of an endless life." Hence, the question which Job's friends mistakingly put in reference to the individual, might have been fairly asked in reference to a people, "When did a nation perish, being innocent?" When did a people cease to flourish that perseveringly obeyed God's commands, and acknowledged Him to be its Lord?

This fantastic Vergeltungslehre, as thus held by the Rationalists, is inconsistent moreover with the tone of the most important and most serious of the Psalms. Comp. Pss. lxxiii., xvii., *etc.* In Ecclesiastes it is most expressly repudiated. In the Proverbs, a purely ethical book, there seems to be more of it, but nothing more than any system of popular ethics, ancient or modern, must admit, namely, that virtue is, in the main, favorable to happiness or prosperity in this world, and that the practice of it, therefore, may well be recommended by the moralist on that ground. In the Proverbs themselves, however, there is evidence that the general truth has its exceptions, not arbitrary, but arising out of circumstances and reasons connected with a higher ground, demanding a higher rule transcending the ordinary experience.

Job's Violent Language the First Cause of Crimination—Opening Address of Eliphaz.

There is no evidence that Job's friends held this secular Vergeltungslehre as a thing exceptionless. Their own speeches frequently admit the contrary idea. They would, perhaps, have advised Job to examine himself, try his ways, pray God, as the Psalmist does,

"to show him if there might be some unknown evil thing in him," that thus he might be "led in the way everlasting." They might have urged him, as the calmer Elihu afterwards did, to regard afflictions, however sore, as sent in love for some mysterious good of discipline or purification. But it is not at all probable that they would have charged him with crimes, had they not been led to do so in consequence of the seeming profanity of his violent language, and his own apparent criminations of the divine justice. This first explains the doubt; and then the increasing harshness of their imputations is the natural consequence of the controversial spirit engendered, becoming the more personal, paradoxical as it may seem, in proportion as it becomes more dogmatic and abstract. Yet still the opening language of Eliphaz is that of a true friend—a pious friend who wished to sooth the sufferer, and yet mildly rebuke his violently complaining spirit. Together with astonishment and compassion, it manifests a tender diffidence which is very finely expressed in Dr. Conant's translation: "Should one venture a word to thee; wilt thou be offended? but who can forbear speaking?" It seems to come after a silence occasioned by a subsidence in the great anguish. There had been, too, a sort of cadence in Job's language which lets us into the interior of the man, showing that his former state, though outwardly fair and prosperous, was not free from spiritual trouble: "I was not at ease, I was not tranquil, I was not at rest, yet trouble came" (iii. 26). There was something strange about the case; yet the words of Eliphaz, that follow, are far from crimination, or even suspicion. It is the gentlest of reproofs, reminding him of what he himself had done to others in similar cases of suffering, and counselling him now to do the same for his own support and consolation: "Lo Thou hast admonished many: Thou hast strengthened the feeble hands; Thy words have confirmed the faltering." Surely this testifies to a belief in Job s previous reputation for benevolence and piety. Nothing could be farther from the spirit of the harsh charges that seem to be made by this same Eliphaz, xxii. 5-10. "Thou hast comforted many"—it is the mildest of rebukes, if it be a rebuke at all—"but now it comes to thee, and thou faintest; it toucheth thee, and thou art confounded. Is not thy *religion* thy confidence (so יראתך, should be rendered); thy hope, is it not the uprightness of thy ways?" Job's character for integrity is remembered and admitted, with the intimation that he should now derive comfort from the thought. Keeping before us this most natural view of Eliphaz's attempt to comfort, we have the key to what follows. It was not received as it should have been; and hence the beginning of that personal controversy which arose, in a great measure, from Job's violent retorts. He begins it; although he has the better of them afterwards, when the polemical spirit, thus aroused, has driven them far from the sympathy they came to express.

Had it not been for the effect produced upon our minds by this latter turn, or had this speech of Eliphaz stood alone, we should have carried with us a different feeling, resulting in a different style of interpretation. The words that follow would have appeared to us in another light: "Remember now"—consider your own experience, try and recall a case—"when has the innocent perished?" The *perfectly innocent*, some would say in order to soften the imputation, but the emphasis is on the word אבד. The use of it is consistent not only with the belief, but even the firm persuasion, of Job's comparative guiltiness, and the hope of his speedy restoration after a temporary trial. אבד is an extreme word of perdition. Here, especially, as the spirit of the context, and its association with that other strong term נכחדו very clearly show, it denotes a final, irrecoverable doom. It is suggested by the idea intimated above, that Job should not forget his religion, his confidence in God, but should derive a pure comfort from the thought of "the uprightness of his ways." God does not mean to destroy you; you shall not utterly sink under this trouble; all will come right at last. Such is the spirit of the appeal. Good men may suffer affliction, but where have you known the innocent to perish? "Therefore, hope thou in God; for thou shalt yet praise Him, who is the salvation of thy face (thine open salvation), and thy God." There is nothing forced in such a view. There may have been a want of appreciation of Job's extreme suffering, such as an outside comforter would find it difficult to conceive, but it seems the best thing that he could do, and the best advice he could offer him under the circumstances.

It is confirmed by the repetition of the question in language still more emphatic, and intended to be still more assuring: "When were the righteous cut off (נכחדו*)—finally cut off? Cheer up, therefore, give not way to despair, God will not forsake thee."

It is not a questioning of Job's righteousness, but an assuming of it, in fact, as the ground on which he should yet exercise hope in the divine restoring goodness. The remark, however, here as well as elsewhere, leads to an enlargement on the doom of the wicked man: but any application of this to Job would be inconsistent with the evident assumptions of the context. This doom of the wicked is not thy doom. He has no fear (no religion), no hope as thou hast. Severe as may be thy pains, thy case is very different from that of the men "who plough iniquity and reap mischief." Thou shalt not perish as those "roaring lions" of evil. He who "breaks their teeth" shall bind up thy wounds. Therefore, hope on. Then follows that sublime account of the spiritual appearance, and the moral lesson it brings from the unearthly sphere, so different from the gabble which the modern naturalizing "Spiritualism" would have given us in its stead, as has been before remarked. It is still that grand theism, presented all alone, and in its ineffable purity, as intended to precede all other articles of faith—God's personal being, and His immeasurable holiness: "Shall a man (אֱנוֹשׁ, weak mortal man) be just with God? Shall a man (גֶּבֶר, the strongest and most confident man) be pure before his Maker?"† He had indeed given Job credit for uprightness; he had clearly intimated that he might and ought to find comfort in the remembrance; but here comes the vision of the night, the solemn, sober, second thought,—that there is something far more holy than our best righteousness, high as that may seem when a man compares himself with other men, or any standard of human ethics. It is an intimation that even Job, with all his uprightness, and though fully corresponding to that charming account given of his moral character in the prologue, cannot yet so stand upon his righteousness as to cry out against suffering—even extreme suffering—as though it were a strange injustice. Far different, indeed, is his case from that of those "lions" of iniquity to whom Eliphaz alludes,—those utterly Godless transgressors to whom their utter perdition is but a "reaping of what they have sown;" but still he is not *righteous*, he is not *pure* before God.

Increasing Severity—Cause of it—Mutual Recriminations—Note on the Atrocious Charges of ch. xxii.

Such is a fair interpretation of this fourth chapter. As uttered in a similar spirit, must we regard much of the language of the fifth; although, probably from some signs of impatience in Job, it seems to increase in severity: "Call now; is there any one who will answer thee" whilst indulging in such extravagant appeals? Who of the Holy Ones can listen to thy imprecatory language? "It is the foolish (evil) man whom wrath slayeth; it is the simple man whom envy killeth." The noun, קִנְאָה, could be better rendered *jealousy*. It furnishes the key to the train of thought, or the view Eliphaz took of Job's state of mind, as complaining of God, because men manifestly wicked had lived and died more free from pain than himself. Though the language be dark, and full of a passionate abruptness, such seems to be the meaning of what he had said, iii. 14–17, about "kings and counsellors" who, after lives of uninterrupted prosperity, have lain down beneath their costly monuments, leaving their houses full of treasure. Why could he not have "so lain down,"‡ at the end of

* The primary sense of כחד is *abnegation*,—treating a thing as though it was not, or casting it off as utterly false and vile. Hence in Hiphil it gets the sense of putting out of sight (ἀφανίζειν, which is used in the Greek to denote extreme destruction), *exstirpavit, delevit.* The Niphal is passive of Hiphil. See its strong sense, Exod. xxiii. 3; Zech. xi. 8.

† *More just* than God, *more pure, etc.* So our translation and Luther have it, with which Dr. Conant agrees. The Vulgate, *Dei comparatione.* Umbreit, Ewald, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Merx, Rosenmüller, *et al.*, reject the idea of מִן, comparative, and regard it as equivalent to עִם, xxv. 4; *Coram Deo*, and in Numb. xxxii. 22; Jeremiah li. 5. The reasons are that the other rendering, "more just than God" would be an utterly extravagant thought, which no one would think of seriously holding. And yet it might be suggested by Job's bitter complainings.

‡ III. 13. ישנתי: "I should have slept; then would there have been rest to me"—יָנוּחַ לִי *to* me, or *even to me.* The impersonal form with the preposition is emphatic. This feeling of distrust and jealousy is made more clear by what he says at the close about his want of rest, even in the day of his prosperity: "What he had somehow feared had come upon him," iii. 25.

an untroubled life, and "been at rest." To correct this murmuring jealousy, Eliphaz insists upon what his own experience had taught him to the contrary: "I have myself seen the wicked taking root, but soon I cursed his habitation" (his seemingly undisturbed stability). I have seen what followed them, the ruin of their posterity, the restorations they were compelled to make. He is not here charging Job with personal crimes, but cautioning him—and surely there was need of it—against being led into complaints of God as one who lets the wicked live and prosper, and die, at last, without any "bands (*dolores*, Ps. lxxiii. 4) in their death." This experience of Eliphaz was true. There is a Vergeltungslehre. God does not let the wicked ultimately prosper, even in this world. During their own lives, and in their posterity after them, this general law of the divine government receives its manifestation. Job's mere groaning under his misery as something inexplicable, is very different from the feeling which suggests such comparisons, as though there were really no God ruling in the earth, and all things happened alike to all, or, what is worse, God actually favors unrighteousness. He himself, Job seems to say, with all his uprightness, was in fact more miserable, had a more grievous lot, than those wicked tyrants. It was this קִנְאָה, or envy, that was killing him. So it seemed to Eliphaz, and it is enough in interpreting that the idea furnishes the clue to the train of thought. God's favoring the wicked, or suffering them to go with impunity, is very different from the idea that he may send suffering, explained or unexplained, upon the comparatively righteous—Eliphaz is here repelling the former idea.

Some similar view may be taken of most of the speeches of the friends in controversy.* They can be explained, or regarded as essentially modified, without supposing that, in the beginning, they had any thought of charging him with crime. That would have been wholly inconsistent with the friendly motive which brought them from their distant homes to mourn and weep with him. The story, it will thus be seen, is best interpreted by regarding it as an actual picture of actual life. But even artistic, or dramatic propriety would be grossly violated by such a preposterous fact, that they should, all of them, all at once, fall to making charges against him, not only so atrocious, but so motiveless and abrupt.

---

* Even the harshest parts assume something of a different aspect when we thus take into view the origin and progress of the controversy. Many of these charges will appear to be essentially hypothetical. For it is clear that the friends of Job had no knowledge of any crimes that he had committed. In ch. xxii. Eliphaz seems to charge him directly with the most atrocious deeds. But the beginning of the chapter is evidently the repelling of the idea, on which Job seems strongly to insist, of a *personal* controversy, as it were, between him and God, or as one *contending* with him. It is not, as Eliphaz would seem to argue, such a personal *contending* whatever else it may be; for that *could* only be on account of some great sins which had truly roused the divine anger. This hypothetical view may be carried clear through the chapter: "Will He for fear of thee rebuke thee, or enter with thee into controversy? Is it not rather (הלא), or *would* it not be rather רעתך רבה, thy great evil, or for some great evil of thine?" So the Vulgate takes it as a hypothetical question instead of a direct charge: *Numquid timens arguat te et non propter malitiam tuam plurimam*; "Would it not be on account of thy wickedness, and because of thine iniquities numberless?" Thus stated, hypothetically, the כי that follows is *specificative*. Would it not be on account of thy numerous iniquities, namely, that thou hadst taken a pledge, that thou hadst stripped the naked, favored the mighty, and oppressed the widow, *etc.*? The manner of stating these crimes (the standing Bible examples of great wickedness) would also seem to show that the imputations were hypothetical, instead of direct. It may be a *suspicion* occasioned by Job's vehement complaints, but it would hardly seem to amount to anything stronger,—or a mere *conjecture*, as Coccelus regards it: "Nam *fortassis* pignus cepisti, *etc.*—conjecturaliter et disjunctive explico, nulla repugnante Grammatica, ne crudeliores sententias quam ipsi ami i in Jobum cudam." Umbreit and Ewald express surprise at the particularity of these atrocious accusations, and wonder how Eliphaz came to the knowledge of them, but the charges themselves they would easily explain by their all-explaining Vergeltungslehre: Job suffered severely; therefore, he must have been an enormous sinner.

What soon follows shows that we must somehow modify the interpretation that makes these charges to be direct, or as something truly believed by the speaker: "Acquaint now thyself with Him (ver 21), and be at peace" (שלם) give up this idea of a contention, or be composed. There is, indeed, a general exhortation to return to the Almighty, and put away evil; as it had also been said that he was in darkness and terror, on account of the spirit he showed (vers. 10, 11, 23). But it is not the kind of language we should expect to be used towards one who had robbed widows, and broken, the arms of orphans. Nothing less than unconditional repentance and restitution would have been thought of. But how different the advice of this reproving friend: הסכן (the Kal, ver. 3, and denoting *quieting*, profitable intercourse) Here, in Hiphil, it is well rendered "*acquaint thyself*," be quiet before God become familiar with Him, learn to think better of Him and His ways; "lay up His words in thy heart." It is addressed to one supposed to be in the wrong, yet still having some degree of favor with God, or, at least, one with whom God was not *contending*, as He *contends* with the hardened and atrocious sinner, so particularly described.

The Dispute turned into the Defensive on the Part of the Friends—Does God favor the Wicked?

In all the steps of the discussion, it will be discovered that it is not so much a disposition to impute actual crime to Job as to repel his seeming assaults upon their theoretical views of the divine justice. The question, whether afflictions may not come upon the righteous, is lost sight of in another which engages all their zeal: Does God favor the wicked? Does He let them prosper, and ultimately die in peace, as Job sometimes seems to assert? They strongly maintain the negative. This leads to the most vivid pictures of the doom that awaits an evil life. Job, not to be outdone, and not heeding his consistency,* is drawn to vie with them in the assertion of his own experience to the same effect. Sometimes they all seem to say very much the same thing, and then it is worthy of note how some commentators strive to give a good aspect to Job's language, and a bad look to theirs; all coming from the traditional assumption in regard to the judgment at the end of the Book. And their apparent recriminations may, in fact, be taken in two ways: Such is the doom of the wicked, the enormous evil-doers; but you, Job, are not one of them, although you are now behaving very wrongly; therefore, you may yet hope in God. Or it may be an actual imputation of crime. The first, as we have seen, may be the view taken of Eliphaz's early address; the second, as the effect produced by the exasperation of debate. It is thus they get themselves entangled in a question truly collateral, yet seemingly connected with the other and more important issue: Are sufferings, in themselves, evidence of crime? Why they are sent upon good men, or why they are permitted even, may remain a mystery; and that mystery, we think, is not solved or attempted to be solved in this Book of Job. But surely it is something quite different from the other thought, that God suffers the wicked to go with impunity, or makes no difference between them and His servants, even in this world.

The Didactic Value of the Speeches as Inspired Scripture.

The idea that the chief design of the Book is the decision of a debate has had an effect, more or less, in perverting its exposition. It all depends upon the view we take of the language used, ch. xlii. 7, and the object of its most immediate reference. Before dwelling on that, however, there may come in here a remark in respect to the value of the various speeches in their didactic use. It is true that, in a dramatic work, we look to the great lesson which it teaches as a whole; and in consistency with this, much of what is said may be regarded merely in its dramatic propriety, and not in its absolute didactic truth as uttered, more or less, by all the speakers. It may be a question, however, whether we can apply this strictly to a composition we deem inspired, or divinely given, even though there may be grounds for calling it dramatic. God may instruct us by this style of writing, as well as by other kinds to which we give the names, historical, poetical, parabolic, ethical, or even mythical, if the evidences of such, or such a kind of diction appear on the very face of it. Thus, Job may be said to contain internal evidence of a dramatic intent. It is not a mere collection of precepts, or lofty sayings, but a great spiritual action, a true praxis or drama, the instructiveness of which does not absolutely depend upon the precise truth, or exact moral value of every utterance that composes it. This is easily understood, and not to be dwelt upon. And yet the thought is not irrational, that such an inspired drama, or one that has a true divine authorship, and for a divine purpose, through whatever media it may have been composed, may be so written, so arranged, and so acted, as to combine both ideas, the dramatic and the preceptive. Even if we regard the speeches of Job's three friends as wrong in their applications, they may, nevertheless, form a body of

* This appears especially in chapters xxi. and xxvii., where Job would seem to aim at surpassing them in this kind of painting. Sometimes the transition is quite sudden, as though he had felt he had gone too far in the opposite direction. The surprise occasioned by this has led to forced constructions. Thus, xxi. 17, some would render כַּמָּה, "how seldom," or, "how often," with the implied idea of doubt, or with a sarcastic reference. This is contrary to the constant usage of כַּמָּה, and Ps. lxxviii. 40, cited by Gesenius and Hupfeld, does not support it.

preceptive truth of the highest value, far beyond anything to be found in Seneca or Epictetus. In this view it may be said of each one of them, that they are Sacred "Scripture, profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness," or that they are divine words "most pure," as the Psalmist says, "like silver tried in an earthen vessel, and seven times purified." Thus regarding them, the practical expositor, and the preacher, may study them with confidence, as golden sentences containing golden truth, and which, when "opened up," as the old lovers of Scripture used to say, will furnish, each by themselves, most profitable themes of meditation. It would be difficult to point out a single utterance made by the three friends of Job that does not contain, in itself, such a golden thought, and worthy of a writing for which there is claimed a divine authorship. All ancient and modern books, Oriental or Occidental, will be searched in vain for a purer or loftier theism than that set forth in these speeches of Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar. The same may be said of Job's language, when regarded as a calm utterance, or something more than a dramatic groan. His impassioned assertions of his integrity, his casting away of all false humility, his vehement expostulations with God, so almost terrifying us by their boldness: "Wilt Thou put in fear the driven leaf; wilt Thou pursue the withered chaff?"—all this may be regarded even with reverence as viewed from the stand-point of the sufferer. There is no cant about Job; no affected piety; no mere sentimentality; no cold and showy theorizing. All this seeming irreverence, nevertheless, is consistent with a manly piety, most anxious to understand its true relation to the Holy One. He seems, at times, upon the borders of profanity. He makes the boldest declarations; but they are all renounced afterwards, when a new aspect of the matter is presented to his mind, leading him to say אמאס, "I reject;" I throw them all away; I cannot bear them now. He argues no more; neither does he remain silent like the others; but falls upon his face, saying, only: "I repent in dust and ashes." Here he said "the thing that was right," wholly right; but even during the calmer periods given to him from suffering, he seems to rise immediately to a higher position. It is after such pauses that he brings in those impassioned soliloquies in which the disputants around him seem wholly lost sight of; as in that meditation on the unsearchable Wisdom, ch. xxviii., or when he breaks out with that sublime appeal: "I know that my Redeemer liveth;" or when he says, "O that I knew where I might find Him;" or when he shows that he can surpass Zophar and Bildad in magnifying the divine glory, whilst he is behind none of them in sententious wisdom.

The right "sayings about God" for which Job is commended.

If, however, there are to be found in the Book any utterances in themselves false or evil, they are to be looked for in those passages in which Job seems to pass almost entirely beyond the bounds of reverence, if regarded as speaking of God (as in ch. xvi.), and not rather of the evil being, of whom, in some way, he seems conscious as a great and malignant antagonist. (See note, page 7.) But the exposition which proceeds upon the idea of the Book being the solving of a problem, or the decision of a debate, must find these false things "said *about* God," or *to* God (אלי), in the utterances of the three friends. This might, perhaps, be maintained if there is intended, not their abstract truth, but their practical application to the sufferer; but then they could hardly be called, with consistency, "wrong things about God." They would have been, rather, wrong things said about Job. Now it may be admitted, that, with all his errors and extravagances, there was a general rightness belonging to Job's position. In spite of his expostulations and vehement upbraidings, even of Deity Himself, there was something in his impassioned sincerity, that called out the divine pity, the divine admiration, to speak anthropopathically, so as to give even his errors, in the divine sight, an interest beyond that of the cold, theoretical, unappreciative, casuistical wisdom of his antagonists. In reference to the whole action of the drama, instead of the mere dialectical merit, it might have been said, in the old patriarchal style, that "Job found favor, or grace, in His sight;" and in this way the traditional exposition may be accepted. We may take it as implied also in any form of the decision, and it may stand, if insisted on, as the leading solution of the Book: "*Job found grace in the sight of God.*" With this, however,

the question may still be raised, whether, in the declaration, xlii. 7, לא דברתם אלי נכונה, "Ye have not spoken," &c., there was not intended a more special saying, a particular and noted declaration standing by itself, as outside of the long discussion—not something which Job had said better than they, but something which he had said, and they did not say at all, —not something said *about* God, but directly *to* Him, and according to the almost exceptionless usage of that most frequent preposition, אל.

Meaning of אֵלַי, xlii. 7.

This is, in the first place, an almost purely philological question. The particle is one of the most common in Hebrew, and we might also add, one of the most uniform in its meaning and application. Let us, therefore, examine whether אֵלַי, in this place, has been rightly translated by the makers of the English and other versions. If not, it might be asked, why have so many commentators taken the wrong direction? The answer may be found in the influence of the view, so early entertained, that the Book was intended as the solution of a problem, and the decision of a debate. The supposed dramatic character and construction aided this idea. The tendency thus given would at once affect this passage, and the same feeling would perpetuate the peculiar interpretation it had originated. Instead of taking as a key the clear and usual sense of the preposition, they made it subservient to a hypothesis derived from other sources. This inverse method appears very plainly in one of the notes of Tympius (285) to *Noldius' Concordance of the Hebrew Particles:* "Luth., Anglic., Trem., Piscat., Belgic., Schmid, Glass, Geier, *de* me. Nam amici Jobi, non *ad* Deum loquuti sunt, sed *de* Deo." Here it is taken for granted that there is a decision of something said concerning God, and the preposition is rendered accordingly. Tympius, with the LXX., Syriac and Vulgate, would render it *before me*, but it is from the same idea of a judicial debate, only carried still farther in that direction; "for the friends," he says, "non sinistre loquuti sunt *de* Deo *tantum*, sed et *de* Jobo, de cruce fidelium, de impiorum in hac vita prosperitate," &c. Some commentators, when they come to this place, simply say אל for על, or אלי for עלי and that is all the notice they take of it; or they content themselves with rendering it *about, concerning, in respect to, von mir, in Beziehung auf mich* (see Dillmann, Delitzsch, Rosenmüller, *et al.*), without giving any reasons. But אל for על is as rare in the Hebrew as *ad* for *de* in Latin, or the English *to* in the same sense. We say, indeed, speak *to* a question, or to a point in debate, but this is a technical sense; it is figurative, moreover, denoting direction, or keeping the mind intent upon a thing, and never used with a person or a personal pronoun. How infrequent in Hebrew is this supposed use of אל for על, may be seen from the few cases* given by Noldius, and of out many hundreds adhering to the common usage.

---

* From these we may at once exclude those in which אל follows the verb נִבָּא, or הִתְנַבֵּא, to prophesy. They may be rendered, prophecy *concerning;* but the preposition does not lose its original idea of direction—prophecy *to*, or *at*, or *against*. So also where Noldius renders it *propter* as Lam iv. 17: "our eyes are consumed," אל עזרתנו, "on account of our help." The idea is, *looking to* or *for* our help, elliptically expressed. There is the same kind of ellipsis in the few other examples he gives, as 1 Sam. iv. 21: "this she said (looking to, *in view of*) the taking of the ark," &c. There is no need of rendering it *propter;* the vivid pathos is lost by so doing. 2 Sam. xxi. 1: "And the Lord said," אל שאול— there is an ellipsis any way. "And the Lord said—to Saul"—that is, *look to* Saul. Noldius fills it up tamely: "(it is) on account of Saul and his bloody house." 1 Kings xix. 3: "He went, אל נפשו, for his life"—a peculiar phrase, but may be rendered literally, instead of by *propter*, on account of. Ps. lxxxiv. 3, "My heart and flesh cry out," אֶל־אֵל חָי, rendered by Noldius: "On account of the living God," but far better literally, "*to* the living God." So in the cases where he would render it *de*, it will be found that the object is ever present, and there is the idea of direct reference, or pointing to it. As 1 Sam. i. 27, where Hannah says, "I prayed, אל הנער הזה, for this child," as something present—the direct object. 2 Kings xix. 32, "Thus saith the Lord," אל מלך. It was indeed *about* the King of Assyria, but how much more vivid is it when taken directly, *to, at, against;* Deodat. French Version, *touchant le roi.* The two or three others under that head can all be resolved in the same manner. 2d Psalm 7, אספרה אל חק, cannot be rendered "*concerning* the decree." Gen. xx. 2, "And Abraham said, אל שרה, to Sarah, she is my wife." Sarah was present, and the saying was *to* her—as an intimation to Abimelech.

Commentators find it difficult to determine for what sayings, in the general argument, Job is commended. The word נְכוֹנָה, xlii. 7.

Another argument for the view here taken is derived from the disagreements among commentators in respect to the things said for which Job is commended and the friends are condemned. According to Ewald and Schlottmann, נְכוֹנָה denotes subjective truth, *uprightness*, integrity. Zöckler takes the other view: It was Job's correct knowledge, and truthful assertion of his own general innocence, in which he was right, and they were wrong, because they failed to acknowledge it, or were silent about it. So Delitzsch says: "The correctness in Job's speeches consists in his holding fast the consciousness of his innocence without suffering himself to be persuaded of the opposite." This would make it almost contrary, in spirit at least, to the language of his confession, when he says אמאס: "I *reject* (throw away, renounce, recant), and repent in dust and ashes;" or in the other place, xli. 4: "I lay my hand upon my mouth; once have I spoken—twice—I will say no more." Raschi takes this "*once—twice*" as referring specially to Job's two hard sayings,* ch. ix. 22; the first: "He consumes the righteous with the wicked," the second: "When the scourge destroys suddenly, He mocks at the distress of the innocent." It is as though Job meant to specify these, because they were the only ones he could remember. In his Rabbinic particularity, Raschi overlooks the Hebraism: "Once—twice," *repeatedly*, over and over again, "have I uttered what I understood not, things too hard for me, which I knew not." See, too, how Dillmann strives to make out a case for Job against the friends, and labors with his distinction between the subjective and the objective truth; as though the declaration itself of the Almighty needed defending and clearing up as much as Job's integrity. In some senses, he would maintain, both were right and both were wrong. Not every word he uttered in itself was true, nor were their's all wrong; but only on the whole, or on the question of Job's innocence, was the balance of truth in his favor. Truly this is a very unsatisfactory view of the great matter which God decides, as though it were a mere question as to the weight of argument in a debate about Job's absolute or comparative innocence; it being a fact, too, of which Job had knowledge, whilst they could only judge from outer circumstances. A man should maintain his integrity, if he is not guilty of particular crimes laid to his charge; that is true; but is there no higher lesson taught in this Book? Again, this mere summing up of a balance of right, with so much difficulty about it as to occasion such a diversity of comment, is inconsistent with the clearness and peculiar nature of that word, נְכוֹנָה. It is not used of personal moral character, either subjectively or objectively, like צדיק, ישר, *etc.* Such a view of the word would seem to confine it to things said about Job, instead of something said about God and addressed directly to Him. The radical idea of the word is *firmness, that which shall stand;* hence *completeness, security, perfection.* When used of an outward object it expresses its best and most finished state, as in the infinitive form, Prov. iv. 18, נְכוֹן הַיּוֹם, the perfection of the day, *σταθερὸν ἦμαρ*, when the sun has reached its height, and seems to stand—"clearer and clearer unto *the perfect day.*" As a saying, it is here the one most perfect saying that could be said—a saying expressing all.

The Real Utterance for which Job is Commended.

We must search among Job's sayings for something corresponding to the high and distinguishing commendation expressed by this word נְכוֹנָה,—something that stands the test, clear, decided, full. When found there will be no mistaking it. It will have a superlative, a finished, and not a mere comparative excellence. Other things said may have been more or less correct, but this is *right, exactly right, the very thing,*—something which, if it had not

* See Raschi Comment. Job xl. 4, xlii. 7. In the latter place he puts his strained interpretation in the mouth of Deity Himself: "Ye have not spoken the right like my servant Job, שהרי הוא לא פשע בי כי אם על אשר אמר תם ורשע הוא מכלה וגו, for lo, he never transgressed against Me except in that he said, The innocent and the wicked He alike consumes," and "of the scourge," *etc.*

been said, would have left all else dark, undecided, insecure. Such was the *saying*, ch. xl. 4, xlii. 1–6, and for this we may believe that Job was specially commended. It was also said directly *to* God, and this perfectly suits the preposition אל, xlii. 7, without any necessity of giving it a sense which, to say the least, is very unusual, and only to be resorted to when the context allows no other. This is certainly not the case here. In giving to אֵלַי the same sense which אל has immediately above, in the words אֶל־אִיּוֹב, there is suggested a reference to Job's confession; and we venture to say, that, had it been so rendered, in the early versions, there would hardly have been a thought of any other interpretation. Commentators, generally, as Aben Ezra has done, would have restricted it to that memorable saying *unto* God, and so have avoided the never-to-be-settled disputes as to the particular respects in which Job had the better of the argument against his three friends. There is also something in the appointment of Job as the sacrificing and interceding priest for the others that is in beautiful harmony with the view here taken of the difference between him and them. They had not fallen upon their faces, and laid their hands upon their mouths; they had not confessed, and "repented in dust and ashes." This Job had done. He humbled himself, and therefore did God highly exalt him to be a priest and a mediator for the others. We will not say that this might not have been a proper distinction conferred upon him for his success in the argument by which he maintained his own righteousness; but the whole spirit of the Scriptures, old and new, seems more in harmony with the interpretation which regards the other as the prominent, if not the only view to be taken of this great decision. It need only be further said, in this place, that the LXX. have rendered אֵלַי, *ἐνώπιόν μου*, the Vulgate, *coram me, in my presence*—before *me.* To the same purport the Syriac קדמי. These are better than the modern versions, since they leave open the question of reference. They are in better harmony, too, with the usual sense of the preposition than the renderings *of*, or *concerning*, *in Beziehung auf mich*, *etc.;* but even these translations have been influenced by the idea of a debate held in the presence of a judge, or umpire, who is to decide on the merits of the argument. It is a notion quite plausible, closely connected with the dramatic conception, but receiving no countenance either in the abrupt address of Jehovah, or in anything previously said by the several speakers.

THE BOOK OF JOB AS A WORK OF ART.

Errors of Interpretation arising from so regarding it.

The tendency to this idea of a problem to be solved, or of a debate to be decided, appears especially in those commentators who have most to say about the Book of Job as a work of art, lauding it greatly in this way, as though to make up for what sometimes seems lacking in a true appreciation of its divine merit. It has given rise to supposed plans and divisions as variant as they are artificial. The great outlines of the Book are marked upon its very face; but when the attempt is made to discover, under this main scheme, a more artistic development, the result is very unsatisfactory. Besides the prologue and epilogue, which are evident enough, the main body of the work has been arranged under certain divisions, or stages in the dramatic action, all regarded as having been regularly planned in the mind of the artist. These are described by technical names invented for the purpose. There is the *δέσις* and the *λύσις*,—the envelopment and the development, the tying up and the loosing. The subdivisions are arranged most artificially, though we can hardly call them artistic, the great excellence of which is the absence or concealment of all studied artificialness. For example, some give as 1st. The Anknüpfung, or Introductory Statement, of which nothing need be said; 2d. The Movement of the Debate, or the Commencing Development, iv. xiv.; 3d. The Second Movement, or the Advancing Development, xv., xxi.; 4th. The Third Movement of the Debate, or the Most Advanced Development, xxii., xxvi.; 5th. The Transition from the Development (or rather the maximum Envelopment), to the Solution, or from the *δέσις* to the commencing *λύσις*, Job's Vindication, xxvii., xxxi.; 6th. The Consummation, or the *Durchbruch*, the breaking through, the transition from the *δέσις*

to the λύσις, the Speech of Elihu, xxxii., xxxvii.; 7th. The Solution in the Consciousness, xxxviii. 42; 8th. The Solution in outward Actuality, Job's Restoration to Prosperity, xlii. 7–17. This is Zöckler's. In the scheme of Delitzsch we have 1st. The Introduction; 2d. The Opening; 3d. The Entanglement; 4th. The Transition to the Unravelment; 5th. The Unravelment Divided into 6th. The Unravelment in the Consciousness; 7th. The Unravelment in outward Reality. There is no need of giving the Divisions of Umbreit, Ewald, *etc.* They are all marked by the same artificialness. They may be an assistance to the memory; but the reader feels that he is getting little or no help from them in regard to the governing idea of the Book, or the meaning of particular passages. The very fact of the differences existing between them detracts from their reliability. Thus regarded, they may be in the way of a true appreciation of the Book, whatever aid they may seem to give in its critical study; for almost any division furnishes some facility in that respect. If, however, the old author really had no such scheme mapped out in his own mind,—if, under the influence of some divine enthusiasm, he was simply giving vent, irregularly it may be, to thoughts of which his soul was full,—or was truthfully relating a story which he had heard, and which was firmly believed in his day,—then all reasonings from such artistic divisions would be "a darkening counsel by words without knowledge," leading farther and farther from the actual fact, and from the divine thought. It all proceeds upon the fixed idea that the object of the Book is solely a debate, dramatically presented and dramatically concluded. There is a problem to be solved, a δέσις, or an entanglement first to be made, as intricate as possible, and then to be untied. For this purpose, God dramatically appears at the end, like a *Deus ex machina*, and closes the debate by deciding in favor of one of the parties, and against the others.

The Reality of the Theophany—Compared with other Theophanies in the Bible.

It is a clear answer to the above dramatic view, that the divine speech itself decides nothing, though Job may be regarded as afterwards commended for the humbling and penitence-producing effect it had upon him. We may say this without irreverence. That most sublime address hardly takes notice of any of the points about which they had been wrangling, whether regarded as matters of fact, or of abstract truth. It had a higher purpose, a grander lesson to teach, —that lesson of unconditional submission, without the learning of which all solutions of problems, whether higher or lower, would be of no avail. God "makes His glory to pass before them," as He did before Moses when hidden in the cleft of the rock, or before Elijah, in Horeb, when "he wrapped his face in his mantle at the presence of the Lord." So Job fell on his face before God, whilst the others stood speechless in bewildered astonishment. To him the vision presented itself in its most interior aspect. He saw something in it beyond the eye of sense,— he heard something, as he himself seems to affirm, beyond "the hearing of the ear." They stood ἐννεοὶ, like Paul's companions on the journey to Damascus, ἀκούοντες μὲν θεωροῦντες δ' οὐ, hearing the outward sounds, distinguishing the words, it may be, in their lexical and logical sense, but having no spiritual perception. Perhaps they, too, had they fallen on their faces, might have had their inward eye opened, as Job's was, and with the same spiritual effect. But he alone "made confession unto righteousness;" therefore, he was justified and they were condemned. We are not attaching too much importance to this divine appearance in making it the central idea as well as the central fact, of the Book. Why should it be turned into a poetical drama, any more than other similar manifestations recorded in the Scriptures? There is no other part of the Bible in which the theophany so belongs to the very essence of the revelation. It is here the very lesson taught. It is something given for its own sake, and not merely as a scenic means to something else. It is that to which all the parts of the wondrous narrative are preparatory, and in which all its words, and all its ideas, all its arguments, true or false, have their culminating significance. Though formally solving no problems, it is not a mere barren display. What more instructive than such an announcement of a personal divine presence challenging to itself the homage of all rational beings? And such is the very idea of revelation. It is not *primarily* to teach us

doctrines, or to give us moral precepts, or to solve questions of ethical or even theological casuistry, but to bring nigh to us the divine power, and right, and vivid personality. All revelation, in short, is the revelation of the glory of God. To those who say that this seems a harsh and arbitrary teaching, the answer is, that it is most intimately connected with the loftiest human well-being. For men to see it is, in fact, their most satisfying knowledge, to confess and feel it is their highest blessedness.

SPEECH OF ELIHU.

The chasm its rejection would leave between the last words of Job, chap. xxix.–xxxi., *and the Divine Appearance.*

Had the Book of Job ended with the speech of Elihu, the reader would have had good grounds for regarding this portion as containing the solution of the problem of which so much has been said. Suffering, as intended for purification and discipline, and therefore consistent with the goodness of God, and a general righteousness in the sufferer; this is the main idea it enforces, and in a way to bring out some of the best practical ethics to be found in this or any other book. No part of Job is, in this respect, better adapted to the moralist or the preacher. Chapter xxxiii., especially, is a mine of precious instruction, clear and practical, full of consolations to good men amid all the trials of life, and of strength for the performance of its duties.* He comes the nearest, too, to the speech of Jehovah, so far as any approach can be made to it, in the descriptions of the divine power as exhibited in the greater natural phenomena. This seems to be done, too, for a similar purpose; to show that God is hindered by no physical fatality; every thing that takes place is by the divine decree, or the divine permission. "He hath done it," and therefore (not as a reason in itself, but as demanding the assent of the finite intelligence) is it holy, just and good. "Why dost thou strive with Him (ריבות, *litigate, reason, argue*); for He giveth no account (לֹא יַעֲנֶה, He maketh no answer) in respect to His matters" (xxxiii. 13). We have already dwelt on a few of the arguments for the genuineness of this portion of the Book, and especially on the difficulty that would be occasioned by having nothing between the noble vindication of Job xxix.–xxxi. and the sudden mention of *the*† whirlwind out of which Jehovah speaks. But there are also internal evidences in its favor. As before said, it is remarkably characteristic, and, in fact, the very traits that are urged against it should commend themselves to those who claim so much critical insight. It is true that Elihu hesitates and repeats, but for this there is a fair and natural explanation. He gives us the impression of one personally diffident in the presence of the older and the wiser, so esteemed, yet conscious of having important and timely truth, the utterance of which he cannot suppress (xxxii. 18–20). He asks pardon of-

---

* The substance of the argument for and against the much controverted genuineness of the Elihu passage, is briefly yet clearly given by Rev. A. B. Davidson, in his excellent Commentary on Job, the first volume of which was published in 1862. After presenting the main objections in the text, with very satisfactory answers of his own, as well as from Stickel and others, he gives, in a note to page xli., some others which he justly styles "examples, less of reason than of critical petulance": "As the following, (1) That Elihu does not appear in the Prologue. But Job's three friends are not named as coming to debate with him; their object was condolence. (2) Elihu is not named in the Epilogue. But there was really nothing to say of him; so far as he agreed with Job he is commended in his commendation; so far as he agreed with the words of God, he has his reward in hearing his own sentiments repeated by the divine lips. The reference made even to the friends of Job, in the Epilogue, is but casual; for the drama concerns Job only, and takes end with him; and even Satan, who should have come before the curtain humbled and prostrate, to receive the jeers of an assembled world, nowhere appears. (3) Job makes no answer to Elihu. And for the best of reasons: His heart is stricken by Elihu's words. (4) Elihu addresses Job by name, as the original disputants do not. But Elihu comes in as an arbiter, and must use names to distinguish between both parties whom he addresses; and God Himself adopts the same mode of addressing Job in opposition to the friends." The objection arising from Elihu's alleged Aramaisms, is well answered by Stickel (cited by Davidson), in saying: "that Elihu is himself an Aramean (ch. xxxii. 2, of the family of Ram, that is, Aram), and naturally spoke in that dialect." But these Aramaisms are greatly overstated. There is evidence in several places of other persons being present during parts, at least, of this long discussion—some to pity, some to mock Job, and some as silent spectators.

† הַסְּעָרָה. The article (*the* storm) is very natural, if we take it in connection with those strong premonitory symptoms of an approaching tempest that marked the close of Elihu's speech. In the other supposed connection it is far from being easy, though possibly allowable.

ten, as Eliphaz had done in the beginning, but with a good grace, manifesting reverence for age, and respect for suffering, but still more respect for what he deems true and right. The "higher criticism," as Davidson says, "cannot maintain its gravity over these peculiarities, and discharges at them a great amount of bad language." "His speeches," it says, "are filled with *gemachtes Pathos*, and *erfolglos Forcirtes*," with other charges of a similar kind. Now, nothing is less reliable, or more uncertain, than this kind of jaunty remark in respect to an ancient composition. It is a pretentiousness worse than any that can be imputed to Elihu, which would pretend to judge thus of words, and style, and the genuineness of certain kinds of phraseology, in a literature affording such scanty means of comparison. Besides, it is very easy to imagine some critical theory of the Rationalists in which these very peculiarities, or similar ones, would probably be cited as all-important. Striking Arabian circumlocutions, they might be called, such as marked the old seances, and were regarded as a literary excellence, or marked Kohelethisms, or any thing else that might be thought to have a critical interest, or a bearing upon the question of some supposed place or time of authorship.

If Elihu is the last speaker, then the words, "who is this that darkens counsel," &c., might be regarded as spoken of him incidentally, or as first disposing of what had just preceded, although the address, generally, is to Job. There might be assigned reasons for this, consistent with the favorable view we have taken of him. The confusion of speech, before alluded to as occasioned by the appalling approach of the storm, and which, he himself confesses, would furnish a ground for it. These opening words resemble very much his own language, as though echoed back to him from the thunder-cloud: "Is it told Him that I am speaking? (אֲדַבֵּר tense of description) we cannot order our speech in the presence of (מִפְּנֵי), or by reason of the darkness." Or, again, it might be called a "darkening of counsel," not in respect to its abstract truth, but when presented as a solution of the great problem, to the exclusion of other grounds in the proceedings of Him who, according to Elihu himself, "giveth no account of His ways."

THE BOOK NOT A SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM OF EVIL.

One might be led to think, at first view, that the great matter worthy of such a sublime Book as this, would be the solution of the problem of evil—how sin came into the world, and man is held accountable. It is the question of the ages, to the settling of which not even the Critical Philosophy makes an approach. There is, however, no allusion to it in the divine allocution, except as comprehended in that awful declaration of power and sovereignty, seeming to say, as the voice said to Moses: "I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious—forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin—visiting iniquities unto the third and fourth generation, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." Beyond this, no solution is offered, and Merx is right in saying, however irreverent it may seem, that if any clearing up of this dark problem had been the design of the Book, it must certainly be regarded as a failure;—that question stands just as it did before.

The Divine Address, and the modern Natural Theology. No argument from Design.

It has been said that this speech of Jehovah contains an implied argument similar in substance to the one offered by our modern Natural Theology. So MERX, *Das Gedicht von Hiob*, pa. xxx.: "It is to exhibit the theology of nature, and that the rational aims visible therein furnish proof that God has like rational aims in all His government, moral as well as physical." With this he connects what Job says about Wisdom,* ch. xxviii., *etc.*, as a preparatory or transition step in the Lösung or Solution of the Problem. The argument may be thus stated: The divine speech is an exhibition of God's wisdom in nature; therefore must we re-

* It is in respect to this that Job is assigned, by many commentators, to what they call the Chokma portion of the Bible, making it coeval with the Proverbs, or the time of Solomon, a little earlier or a little later. Delitzsch supposes the Wisdom of the Proverbs to be an advance development, and therefore later. Merx, on the other hand, regards the author of Job as "polemizing" against the Proverbs writer. But why not the other way, if there is a difference, the author of Prov. viii. "polemizing" against the older author of Job?

gard it as intended to show that He must be equally wise in His spiritual government. But that would not be a solution. It would be simply an assertion, on a grander scale, of what is assumed by all the speakers throughout the Book, all of whom seem to vie with each other in lauding the divine wisdom. Job especially dwells upon its greatness and unsearchableness (xxviii. 20, &c.), leaving to man, as *his* peculiar and highest wisdom, the duty of reverencing it (ver. 28), acknowledging it, and "departing from evil." Architectural excellence is, indeed, a pervading idea of this divine address; but that power, almighty power, is the predominant one, is shown not only in the general style of its thunder tones, but also in its effect on Job, whose first words in reply are: "I know that Thou canst do all things," as before cited: Now I know it, whatever misgiving thought of some fatality I may have betrayed in former words now wholly renounced. It does not tell us in general that God acts solely from moral reasons; there is something in the language that gives the idea of artistic purposes regarded as having a value in themselves, aside from any moral or utilitarian considerations. He may make worlds, and lesser works, such as some of the great animals, for the glory and beauty of them, irrespective of any benefit* to man, or to other rational beings.

The Divine Ways Transcending and Ineffable. Eph. iii. 10; *John* ix. 3.

There may be æsthetic reasons. And then, again, there may be others altogether ineffable, whose explanations man could not receive if God, or super-human beings, should offer them. What right have we to apply the measure of our Ethics, or our Psychology, or our Ontology, to Him "whose ways are above our ways, and whose thinking is above our thinking, even as the heavens are high above the earth," that is, immeasurably and inconceivably beyond us? Sober Scripture sanctions such a representation. As before intimated, the designs of God, in His dealings with men, may be connected with effects to be produced in higher spheres (Eph. iii. 10, before cited); and so what He does, or permits to be done, to individuals may have relations, wise and just, extending far beyond them, whether in the present world or in any other. We are safe here in simply receiving the teaching of our Saviour (John ix. 2) when "the disciples asked him: Rabbi, who sinned, this man himself, or his parents, that he was born blind?" It was for the sin of neither, is the answer, "but that the works of God might be made manifest in him." Here is no throwing it upon nature, as the Rationalist would have done, but a positive assertion of a Divine purpose, and yet that that purpose had respect to something altogether separate from any punishment, discipline, or general well-being of the individual sufferer. "Who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say unto him who formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?" Such is the idea that is brought to us by this voice from the thunder-cloud. It is that of a personal omnipotence unchallengeable, doing *all things* wisely, all things well, yet giving no account (לא יענה, *answering* not) to any who demand the reason of its ways. It is the first great truth for man to learn—the predominant truth to take rank before all others—the fundamental truth, not for the infancy of the world merely, but most especially needed in this age of naturalism, of scientific boasting, of godless spiritualism.

THE TRUTHFULNESS OF THE NARRATIVE.

Is Job a truthful narrative, a legend with a dim nucleus of fact, or a pure fiction? In answer to the first of these questions, some would deem it sufficient to say, that the book is a poem on its very face. But this does not settle the matter. It may be so called unquestionably; and yet it may well be doubted whether, at the date of its authorship, even assigning it to the Solomonic period, there was that clear line of distinction between prose and poetry that afterwards existed. All high and animating thought has a tendency to measured language, to some kind of formal emphasis or repetition called parallelism, and which, in the Shemitic tongues, at least, is the beginning of rhythmical movement. It seems to be a demand of strong emotion, or of some strong interest in the thought expressed, whether devotional,

* The modern Natural Theology has very little like it in the Bible. It may be said, too, in general, to be out of the line of the ancient thinking, Pythagorean and Platonic, as well as Shemitic. Ideas, divine thoughts, as having in themselves an artistic or intellectual excellence, in a word, the glory of God, take precedence of mere utilitarian final causes.

prophetic, or sententious. There is reason, too, for thinking that the more animated colloquial style among the Hebrews and other Shemitic peoples had much of this parallelism or germinal poetry; as in the language of Abigail to David, 1 Sam. xxv. 28, 29, or in the pleadings of the widow of Tekoah, 2 Sam. xiv. 13, 15, and other places that might be cited, where just in proportion as the thought or feeling rises in earnestness, do the words also seem to rise into a species of parallelism, and take on more and more of a rhythmical aspect. Thus viewed, the style of the speeches in Job may be held to be the natural one for the expression of such thoughts, requiring neither study nor artifice. That was the way men talked when deeply earnest, or under the influence of strong emotion, or when the gravity of the ideas discussed seemed to demand something corresponding to it in the style of utterance, some measured cadence, be it of the simplest kind, that might mark them as grave and emphatic. The exact prose style, on the other hand, may have been, in fact, the more artificial, as carefully avoiding this kind of sententious, emotional utterance, so ill adapted to statistical narrative, though suiting well the thoughtful soliloquy, or some forms of animated colloquialism. There is, therefore, really nothing unnatural, nothing artificial—rather the reverse—in the fact that these speeches in Job have this easy rhythmical cadence, which the reader, if he have taste and feeling, must acknowledge to be in perfect harmony with the gravity of the subjects discussed. Far removed as we are from this Oriental style, we should have been a little surprised, nevertheless, had the lamentations of Job, and the responses of his friends, been carried on in the same kind of talk we have in the prologue and other narrative Scripture.*

* Instead of a sense of artificialness, it is truly with something like a feeling of ease and freedom that we emerge from the curt, statistical dialect into these more spontaneous utterances, in whatever parts of the Bible they may occur. As when Moses, as though weary of his lawgiving, breaks out into song:

> Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak;
> And hear, O Earth, the words of my mouth.

Equally unconscious of anything artificial was Isaiah when he opens his prophecy with similar language, or predicts that men

> Shall beat their swords into ploughshares,
> Their spears into pruning-hooks;

Or the sententious Solomon thus falling into measure in the utterance of his prudential wisdom:

> My son, hear the instructions of thy father,
> And forsake not the law of thy mother.

It is found everywhere in Scripture, and in the mouths of all classes, whatever may be their variety of character:

> Lord, when Thou wentest out of Zion,
> When thou marched'st out of the field of Edom.
>
> —Deborah.

> Where thou goest, I will go;
> Where thou lodgest, I will lodge;
> Thy people shall be my people,
> Thy God my God.
>
> —Ruth.

> The soul of my lord is bound in the bundle of life;
> The souls of thine enemies cast forth from the sling.
>
> —Abigail.

> For we must needs die, and are as water spilt,
> But God doth gather again his banished ones.
>
> —Widow of Tekoah.

> The Spirit of the Lord spake by me;
> His word was in my tongue.
>
> —Last Words of David.

> The Lord maketh poor and maketh rich;
> He bringeth low and lifteth high.
>
> —Hannah.

So in Luke, Elizabeth, and Mary, and Simeon, break out spontaneously in this same rapt measured language; and in like manner does John in the Revelation rise into poetry, if we choose to give it that name. It is, however, nothing essentially different from what we have in the Psalms and Job, and even in Ecclesiastes. Those who made such utterances did not think they were speaking or writing *poetry as a studied or artificial language*. The state of soul, as caused by the moving circumstances, made it spontaneous; usage made it easy; it was a natural speaking—not an *improvising* as some might be inclined to call it; for that implies something like *knack* or *skill*, however acquired, and has, besides, but little of value or significance beyond the mere surprise it occasions. It need only be said, that we have something of an echo of this old style in the Koranic rhymes and cadences, though there the artifice is clearly visible.

The Book of Job a Drama, and yet subjectively true.

The two ideas are perfectly consistent. It may have the dramatic form, the dramatic interest, the dramatic emotion, the dramatic teaching, and yet be substantially a truthful narrative. Making allowance for what are merely matters of language, such as the use of round and double numbers to express things that are beyond statistical estimate, we may believe in the general outward verity, whilst regarding this mode of stating the vastness of Job's possessions, and the suddenness of his calamities, as itself evidence of a subjective truthfulness. It testifies to the deep impression left by the story as explicable only on some basis of actuality consistent with emotional hyperbole, but repelling the thought of artistic skill or frigid invention. It is this subjective truthfulness which is all that is required for a true faith in the divinity of the Holy Scriptures. It includes every thing else of value, and, once firmly held throughout, brings with it the idea of the outward supernatural as not easily separable from such a book, and such a history, lying, as it does, in the midst of such cotemporary human surroundings. We are compelled to take with it a corresponding measure of objective truth, regarded as separate from the necessarily emotional language, or as far as may be demanded for the moral and spiritual impression. In this way, what we have called *subjective truthfulness* may be very easily defined. It is the perfect honesty of the writer or writers whom God has chosen as the recorders of the great objective events which constitute the revelation He has made to the world. We are only to suppose that they heartily believed the truth of what they wrote, according to its evident intent as historical, dramatic, or allegorical, to be judged of according to the clear marks left upon its style. When we thus believe in the perfect honesty of the writers, we shall find ourselves, if truthful and candid, compelled to believe in a great deal more. Applying this to the Book of Job, we can thus hold that the writer, whoever he may have been, and in whatever age he may have lived, truly believed the substantial historical verity of what his pen has transmitted to us. This subjective truthfulness is unaffected by the steps or media through which such a belief may have come to him. It may have been in one of three ways: the writer may have been an eye-witness; or he may have received it from near cotemporary testimony, in which he fully trusts; or it may have reached him through a tradition, of whose substantial truthfulness he has no doubt. There has thus come to him the substance of the story: a rich and prosperous man suddenly reduced to the extreme of poverty, bereavement, and pain; his sore trial, the treatment of his friends, the prolonged discussions between them, the alleged divine interposition, and the sufferer's restoration to a state of still greater prosperity. Along with this is the idea of a super-earthly nexus of events, originating the providential means by which the trial is brought about, and furnishing a reason for the strange suffering. This revelation of events belonging to the superhuman sphere, and the modes by which they may be supposed to become known to the human mind, whether as pictorial accommodations, or in any other way, present a question standing by itself. The ground of faith in them, is the same as that of other Scriptural narratives which carry us above the plane of human knowledge. It is enough for one who believes in the Bible as truly a divine book, that they are spiritually and dramatically consistent with the earthly events of the story and the spiritual design to which they furnish the key. On the round numbers we have already remarked. They should disturb no one who is familiar with the style of the Bible. They are simply methods of expressing vastness without regard to statistical accuracy. It may be said, indeed, that the use of units, tens, and hundreds, in such narratives, would have furnished good ground of suspicion, or actually detracted from our perfect trust in this subjective truthfulness of the writer which we rationally regard as beyond every other excellence. The same may be said in respect to the rapid connection of the events. It is a picture giving us the most vivid impression of suddenness, or one trouble coming whilst another is fresh in its effect and remembrance, breaking the victim, as Job says, "with breach upon breach." Human experience confirms this as something not infrequent in the great trials of life, to whatever causation they may be referred. Such a story leads to hyperboles. They may almost be said to be its natural and therefore most truthful language. Their ab-

sence would betray an unemotional state out of harmony with the deep interest of the events believed.* They would characterize the style even of an *animated* eye-witness. Still more might they be expected in one who gives such an account its second transmission ; and thus this language of emotion would become its fitting, or, as we might even call it, its truthful vehicle, getting a traditional form which is the strongest evidence of a once vivid actuality, easy to be distinguished from the wild myth, or the more fanciful legend. The same view may be taken of Job's restoration. In itself, it is not an improbable event. The round numbers here are doubled, but this, too, is matter of language. It is a mode of expressing the fact that the restored prosperity greatly exceeded that of the former state; as in sober descriptive Greek we may have διπλάσιος used as only another term for πολυπλάσιος, or the multifold.† In judging of this truthfulness, it is enough if we can be satisfied of the absence of all invention, or of any thing that looks like literary artifice. There is abundant internal evidence, that the scenes and events recorded were real scenes and real events to the writer, whoever he may have been. He believed the story; he gives the discussions either as he heard them, or as they had been repeated, over and over, in many an ancient *consessus.* The very modes of transmission show the deep impression it had made, in all the East, as a most veritable as well as most marvellous event. It may be this, and yet as truly a drama, with its heroic action, whether outward or spiritual, and having as much right to the name‡ as any others, so-called, which are inventions, either in whole or in part.

---

* It is, in fact, this very kind of language, indicating, as it does, the absence of invention, which shows the state of the writer's mind in relation to it, and his firm belief in the substantial truth of the story, whether derived from near witnesses, or from remoter tradition. As we have elsewhere remarked (*Note to Lange Gen.*, p. 319), "there is something in this subjective truthfulness as denoted by wide and rounded statements. which is far more precious to a right faith, than any attempt at objective or scientific accuracy." "*All the high hills under the whole heaven*," Gen. vii. 19, is evidently the language of a *spectator* deeply moved by the scene as he beholds it. How much more full of satisfaction is this to a right thinking, than any numerical or geographical settlement of the question about the *extent* of the flood. In the emotion evidently denoted by such words, there is carried the vivid impression of reality, and this is what we most need. So, too, Acts ii. 5: "And there were dwelling in Jerusalem Jews devout men out of every nation under heaven!" We cannot resist the feeling of some most real memorable assemblage, that gave rise to such an impassioned description. It is not at all the style of legend but of deep emotion. A still more remarkable proof of our seeming paradox, is the language of the loving and beloved disciple, John xxi. 23. What a vivid reality must there have been in that character which calls out the seemingly extravagant language: "Not even the *world* could contain the books that should be written." The comparison is to be taken, not as a measure of outward fact, but as an expression of devotion, of admiration, of boundless love. In this sense it is no extravagance; the hyperbole wholly disappears. When John wrote that Gospel, the world of sense, with all its images, failed to set forth the excellence of Christ. "Heaven and earth were full of his glory." He must have lived, most *objectively* lived, who produced such an impression. Inwardly it was the most truthful of utterances. Let us suppose that the statement had been more guardedly made, and instead of the *world* it had been said: "Hardly a folio volume would have sufficed for the recital of what Jesus had done ;" how would it have diminished that real power and truthfulness to which the strongest utterances were inadequate.

The same view may be taken of all parts of the Old Testament, where immense numbers, especially round numbers, are employed; as in the emotional statements of certain great battles with their countless slaughter. The case is different when statistical accuracy enters into the very essence of the account, as in the details of the Tabernacle and of the Levitical sacrifices.

† A difficulty is made from the statement of Job's age at the close of the Book. It comes from adding the number there mentioned (140 years) to his supposed former life, which could hardly have been less than 50 or 60 years, thus making, in all, two hundred years or more. But there is no need of this; the most easy and unforced rendering would take this term, 140 years, as the entire length of his life. He lived till he became 140 years old. This is in harmony with his seeing his children to the fourth generation, or great grand-children, even though born after he was fifty years old. The words אַחֲרֵי זֹאת, "*after this*," are not in conflict with such a view. It may very easily be rendered: "After this Job lived on, even to the age of 140 years." Such an age is not improbable, even for a later time than the patriarchal. There are examples of such longevity in quite modern times.

‡ There are the best of reasons for calling Job a drama, if we do not take the word in too narrow a sense. It has all the essential parts of such a composition: its Prologue, its Dialogue, and its Crisis. It has, moreover, its great ἄθλον, *trial* or *prize*. It is the very heart of the Book, possessing even an Epic grandeur of interest. The *integrity* of Job, the very soul of Job, we may say, is the matter of this test, the subject of this ἀγών, or strife between God and Satan. To accommodate Homer's language, *Iliad* xxii. 160, to a far higher theme:

οὐχ ἱερήϊον, οὐδὲ βοείη,
ἀλλὰ περὶ ΨΥΧΗΣ μάρνανται ἀθανάτοιο.

Even if its action were wholly spiritual, it would, none the less, be entitled to the name dramatic. It has, however, as much of outward movement as the Prometheus Vinctus of Æschylus, or the Philoctetes of Sophocles. In the latter, too, the dramatic interest is chiefly in the spiritual strife arising out of intense bodily pain.

Or it may be regarded as purely poetic, in fact as well as in form, with the exception, perhaps, of a few human elements, whether legendary or historical, that may have aided in inspiring the idea of its composition. By those who adopt this view, as is done by some of our most pious as well as learned commentators, it is, of course, held that the Prologue, and the Theophany at the close, belong to the dramatic scenery. As maintained, however, by men like Hengstenberg, Dillmann, and Delitzsch, this theory of poetic invention does not come from any such aversion to the very idea of the supernatural as characterizes the whole Rationalist school. It is not with them the mere shunning of difficulties, or for the sake of making the Book more credible and acceptable as a part of Holy Writ. They think that they discover in the Book itself, in its apparent plan and style, evidence of such dramatic intent. And this does not diminish its value. There is almost every style of writing in the Bible, historical, devotional, ethical, allegorical, and even mythical. God may employ this dramatic mode of representing truth as well as any other. It may be received as we receive the parables of our Saviour. There would be demanded, however, a method of exegesis different from that which would be proper for such books as Genesis and Samuel. Another reason is that they regard this kind of didactic representation as belonging to what they call the Chokma period (the Wisdom or Philosophy period) of Hebrew literature, and, therefore, not to be judged by the same rules that would be applied to the older Scripture. This view of Job as being, in the main, a poetic invention, at least in its superhuman representations, may be regarded as the one now current in the Christian Church. The weight of critical argument may even seem to be in its favor; and yet it may not be amiss to consider what may be said for the older view, and whether there is such a difference, in this respect, between Job and other parts of the Bible.

The Rationalist is repelled by the supernatural everywhere. He has a most irrational, and yet an easily-explained, dislike to the very idea, in whatever part of the Scriptures he may meet with it. Viewing it then as a question wholly by itself, it may well be asked, why the superhuman accounts in Job may not be received just as we receive them in the narrations of Exodus, or of Luke's Gospel, or of the Acts of the Apostles. The question may refer to the supernatural simply when displayed upon earth as visible matter-of-fact, or to superhuman scenes narrated as transpiring in a superhuman sphere. In regard to the latter, it may be said, as we have before hinted, that the difficulties are by no means peculiar to the Book of Job. The question as to the *mode of inspiration*, or the way in which such superhuman or ante-historical facts become known to the writers, meets us in other parts of the Bible. The same mystery hangs over the first of Genesis. It suggests itself immediately in reading such accounts as that of 2d Chronicles xviii. 18–21, or the recitals of divine messages coming to the prophets. If, however, we are convinced, on general grounds, that the Bible is a divine book in the honest sense of the word, that is, given specially by God for our instruction in a way that other books are not, the minor difficulties vanish. If the Book of Job, or any other book, is truly inspired, and we receive it as such, then may it be trusted that God provides for all such communications, whether by trance vision, by symbolic imagery, or by filling some human mind with the general idea and the accompanying emotion, then leaving it to its own modes of *conceiving*, as controlled, more or less, by its measure of science, and clothed in its own necessarily imperfect human language. Thus may it be given to us in the Holy Canon as the representative of a superhuman fact, some knowledge of which is demanded *as a fact* ineffable, or incapable of communication in any other way. To deny the possibility of this is simply the bold irrationality of affirming that there can be no communication between the infinite and the finite mind, or of still more recklessly asserting that there are no superhuman scenes—that between man and God, if there be a God, there is an infinite blank, unoccupied by beings or events, and in which nothing can

---

We may say, too, on the ground of the same authorities, that its historical truth, be it more or less, does not at all stand in the way of its dramatic character. Some degree of such historical truth, real or supposed, is, in fact, demanded by it. All the Greek tragedies are so constructed on old narratives believed to be real; such as those of the Trojan and Argonautic ages. It needed something of the kind to inspire them; so that while a few, like the *Persæ* of ÆSCHYLUS, are almost wholly historical, none are pure fictions.

take place that may, in any way, affect the course of the human history either collective or individual. Some such general view in regard to modes of revealing may be rationally adopted by one who regards the book of Job as true and inspired—that is, in some way given by God as other books are not. If uninspired, if a mere human production, then this Book of Job has for us simply an archaic interest, like the early Arabian songs, or some Carmen Moallakat written in golden letters, and suspended in the temple at Mecca. If no higher view can be taken of it than this, then, surely, the vast amount of comment bestowed upon it, by Rationalists as well as by believers, has been far beyond its deserts. The immense labor might have been better devoted to other and more useful purposes.

The Supernatural in Job not to be Rejected.

A rejection of the book on the ground of its supernatural and superhuman origin is simply in accordance with the procedure of the Rationalists everywhere. They even think it too much for its poetry, unless regarded as fiction throughout, or without any nucleus of truth, however dim and legendary. Thus, in defiance of such passages as Isaiah vi. 1–4, Umbreit asserts that the Old Testament recognizes no theophanies after the times of Moses. In Job, therefore, it was a pure poetic fiction, hardly admissible unless the action and the scenery are dramatically assigned to the Patriarchal period. And so he asks with an expression of contempt for any one who might even imagine the contrary: "Wenn die ganze Sache Dichtung war, was war denn die Gotteserscheinung im Sturme? Wahrheit?" It is not, however, the degree of outward splendor in the theophany, or the magnitude of the sense marvel, as we may call it, that makes the difficulty for this class of interpreters. The objection is to any idea of God in the world as a manifest causation, whether it be in "the whisper," or in "the thunder of his power" (Job xxvi. 14). They are haunted by the thought of their dislike to the miraculous in any sense, or of any divinely-caused deviation from the course that things would otherwise take, whether in nature or in history. And yet they must reject the most undeniable facts, or admit marvels greater, in truth, than any that may be styled physical miracles—strange deviations from the general course of things in the moral and spiritual human, that, to a thoughtful contemplation, are more inexplicable than any analogous departures or irregularities, seemingly, in nature. Such an anomalous spiritual phenomenon is the very position of this old book of Job, or this old "poem," lying, as it does, in the literature of the ancient heathen world. Let the serious yet intelligent reader fix his mind upon the cotemporary theologies and mythologies. A little to the south-west lies Egypt, so lauded now for its ancient culture, and its alleged longæval supremacy in what is called civilization, or the peculiar condition of "the higher man,"—Egypt, so well known then as the land of crocodile and serpent worship, of the grossest animal superstition, of the most debasing, God-forgetting worldliness. Not far to the east, or just beyond the Indus, are the monstrous forms of Nature worship, as exhibited in the strangest combinations of mystic, pantheistic, and polytheistic ideas. To the Mediterranean west, yet still within the Shemitic knowledge, are the myriad fancies of the Greek mythology, with its Bacchanalian festivals, its worship not only destitute of moral power, but the cherisher everywhere of impure ideas—æsthetic, it is true, famed for its ideas of the beautiful in art, yet most unclean. Almost in contact with it lies the Dagon idolatry, or fish worship, of the Philistines and the Phœnicians. To the north, on the Euphrates, the weird Chaldæan and Babylonian superstitions, as we learn from the dark phantoms of them that haunt us in reading the book of Daniel. Right below it, on the south, the Sabæan idolatry, or star worship, which had infected the primitive monotheism of the Shemitic Joktanites. There is no need of going farther in such a summary. Everywhere was there the rapid verifying of Paul's words (Rom. i. 21–28), setting forth the ways in which men destroy for themselves the pure knowledge of a personal God. Now think of this book of Job in the midst of such surroundings—the transparent purity of its religious ideas yielding in no respect to the loftiest of modern conceptions, the marvellously sublime representations it makes of the divine personality, omnipotence, infinity, unsearchableness, wisdom, grace and holiness—in a word, its distinguishing theism jealous even of the admiration of the heavenly bodies, the "sun in its splendor, the moon walking in brightness," lest it might

seem to detract from the reverence due to Him "who setteth his glory *above* the Heavens." What restraining and conserving influence kept it so clean, so rational, so holy, in the very midst of such abounding impurities? If tendencies so universal and so constant may be called *nature*, then surely must there have been here the manifestation of a divine power. That One above the human sphere should sometimes speak to us, even though it might be in a voice from the cloud, is not a greater marvel for the reason, though it might be more astounding to the sense. For reason, too, has its marvels, and one of them—the greatest of them, perhaps—would be such an everlasting silence of the super-human worlds, or that to man—himself a supernatural as well as a rational being—no direct communication should ever come from a higher plane than that of nature.

It is the moral sublime of the book of Job that makes the supernatural—if fair criticism should allow us to regard it as having such an element—all the more easy of belief. With such an accompaniment, it becomes all the more natural—if we may use the seeming paradox—or the more to be looked for in the whole course of things including every movement, moral and spiritual as well as physical. It seems fitting that there should be a theophany in such a drama; and this fittingness would be none the less if we regard the human elements as being, at the same time, an outward historical reality. And so we might say of the supernatural everywhere in the Bible, so different from the wild, grotesque, unmeaning, or monstrous supernatural that meets us in all those "other ancient mythologies" with which the Rationalist is so fond of classing the Hebrew Scriptures. In these other books, these "other mythologies," there is nothing to give significance to the miraculous, whereas throughout our Holy Book, from the opening creative scenes to the apocalyptic closing, it is the great moral and spiritual, the great theological ideas, that make the supernatural events narrated seem its fitting and most reasonable accompaniment. It would be strange, on the other hand, that, in connection with such grand unearthly teaching, the appearance of a super-earthly power, the intervention of a super-earthly mind or voice, should be wholly lacking.

It is thus that we may hold in respect to this Book of Job. Is there internal evidence, as some of the best critics maintain, for regarding it as a divine poem, and the opening and closing events as the appropriate dramatic scenery? Such a view is entirely consistent with a belief in its inspiration, and of its being designed to occupy a high place in the Divine Canon. Aside from such a theory, however, and such alleged internal evidence, or regarded simply in themselves, the supernatural events that appear to be set forth in this book may be received just as we receive similar narrations in other parts of the Bible. What is there in the voice from the storm cloud, or even in the prolonged utterances that follow it, more incredible than the voice from Sinai with its specific law-givings, the voice to Elijah in Horeb, the voices that, in some way, came to the Prophets, the voice from the burning bush, the voice that spake to Paul from the midday sky? Above all, what is there in it more strange or faith-surpassing than what is told us in respect to our Saviour's baptism, when the Heavens opened, and the Spirit descended like a dove, and a voice from the firmament was heard saying: "This is my Beloved Son in whom I am well pleased?" In all these cases the exceeding greatness of the moral sublime throws in the back-ground the physical strangeness. There is a harmony in it which not only favors, but demands assent. Granting the human elements of the story, just as they are narrated, in all their human and *natural* grandeur, the supernatural, whether voice or appearance, seems but its fitting complement. It is true, that to those who are eye-witnesses of the event, the miracle is the attestation of the doctrine; but for minds that read or contemplate it, the converse also holds: it is the glory of the truth that makes the miracle easy of belief.

[illegible] from the presence [illegible] to Him, [illegible] the glory above the Heavens? What [illegible] and [illegible] influence [illegible] as natural as [illegible], the very [illegible]. If [illegible] is universal and so constant [illegible] been [illegible] the communication of a divine power. [illegible] though it [illegible] from the [illegible], [illegible] which might be more [illegible] to the [illegible]. [illegible] the greatest of them perhaps—would [illegible] of the [illegible] world, [illegible] should ever come from a higher [illegible] of nature.

It is the moral sublimity [illegible] of this book [illegible] if this religion should allow us to [illegible] the more easy of belief. With such an accompaniment [illegible] and the [illegible] paradox [illegible] the [illegible] moral and spiritual [illegible]. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the truth that [illegible] of paradox.

SPECIAL INTRODUCTION TO THE RHYTHMICAL VERSION.

The term Rhythmical is preferred to Metrical, because the latter name, though in itself appropriate, is also used of Biblical translations not strictly in Rhythm, or Metre, but only adopting the metrical division, ἐν στίχοις, or as suggested by the Hebrew parallelism. The present is an attempt to give the Book of Job in a true rhythmical form. The determination of that form, however, requires careful study. There are, it is said, some old English Versions of Job in rhyme. That, however, was not to be thought of. Aside from the difficulty such a method would make in preserving the exegetical accuracy demanded, it was felt that to such a production as Job the jingle of rhyme would be altogether belittling. Our common blank verse line of five feet would present no great difficulty in itself. With a little change, even our Common English Version might be put into that form with a preservation of all such accuracy as it possesses. But there were two objections to it. The first is that such blank verse, though having more dignity than rhyme, would become too monotonous, as the reader would presently feel, and would, therefore, be poorly adapted to the exceedingly passionate and abrupt parts of this divine poem. In the second place, it would require a disregard of the Hebrew accentuation and parallelism as determining the close of lines, and demanding inequality. What we call blank verse is, in fact, only rhythmical, or, rather, measured, prose. The divisions into lines on the page of the book are but for the eye. The thought goes over them, not only to the completion of sentences, but of clauses and subordinate divisions. In other words, the ends of lines are not marked by any peculiar cadence either in the rhythm, as in Greek, or in the thought, as in Hebrew. By the ear alone, one could not tell whether the reader was at the beginning, at a mid cæsura, or at the ends of verses. Now the Hebrew parallelisms, whether they have within them what may strictly be called rhythm or not, are ever marked by distinct closings, determined both by the cadence of the thought, and by the position of the accents. This must be attended to,—and the translator has aimed at its strictest observance. For such a purpose, inequality of lines is absolutely demanded, since the Hebrew divisions thus made are of very different lengths. Besides, such inequality, if rightly managed, is an excellence and a beauty in itself. It prevents monotony, and gives, moreover, the freedom that is wanted in the more impassioned parts,—especially in Job's sighing, soliloquizing, and sometimes almost delirious utterances.

Thus the reader will perceive, that in order to preserve these important elements of parallelism and accent, there has been employed a very peculiar kind of rhythm. It bears an outward resemblance to what is sometimes incorrectly called Pindaric in English verse. But this is a misnomer, because the true Pindaric has different kinds of feet, or measures, as well as different lengths of lines. Here, however, one kind of foot, the iambus (◡—) or the iambic spondee, is universal. Other feet, as they very rarely occur, are merely substitutes for it. Thus the anapæst (◡ ◡—) is used sometimes at the beginning of a line, as also a choriamb (—◡ ◡—), occasionally, but ever in such a way as to commence a dipode with the stronger ictus. The tribrach (◡ ◡ ◡) very rarely occurs. It is avoided as unmusical, though commonly regarded as admissible among English iambi.

In regard to the lines, the principal one is the common pentameter, or blank verse line of English poetry. The Alexandrine comes in much more rarely, and almost always in the second or closing part of a parallelism. In such a position, especially at the end of some impassioned utterance, comes, now and then, the heptameter, or long line of seven feet, used by Bryant in some of his poems, and by Chapman in his translation of Homer. It is equivalent to two lines of our Common Metre, but much more harmonious, on account of its long unsevered movement. As in the first line of the following couplet:

> **And thou thyself | in ripened age | unto thy grave | shalt come,**
> **As sheaf that in its season to the garner mounts;**

the second being an Alexandrine. Mingled with the common blank verse line of five, there comes very frequently one or more of four feet; whilst in the transitions, and in the commencement of some new peculiar strain, there are short lines of three, and occasionally of two feet, or a single dipode. The trimeter not unfrequently makes a very satisfactory close after pentameters:

> **Higher than Heaven's height! what canst thou do?**
> **Deeper than Sheol's depths! what canst thou know?**
> **Its measurement is longer than the earth,**
> **And broader than the sea.**

But what need of this? it may be said. The great thing is to get the idea, however it may be expressed, in English. Attempts at verse must necessarily impair the force and clearness of the thought. To this it may be replied, in the first place, that facility, smoothness in reading, are to be desired, if the sense is not sacrificed, and that the *feeling* accompanying the *thought* may be a most important part of the thought itself. In the second place, paradoxical as it may seem to some minds, it may be maintained that the sense is actually made more clear in a rhythmical translation, if properly done, inasmuch as it gives that element of emotion without which the sense, in its essence and entirety, is not truly received. There may, indeed, be an overloading, and an obscuration, arising from too much artificialness; but whether that can be charged upon the present attempt, is left to the judgment of the reader. For fuller reasons in support of a position that may seem so paradoxical, he is referred to the *Introduction to the Metrical Version of Ecclesiastes*, Vol. X. of the LANGE Series, page 171. The ground taken is that we cannot do justice to poetry unless we read it as poetry,—that is, not simply *knowing* it to be such in the original, but *feeling* it to be so as we peruse the translation. Now this cannot easily be done in a rough unrhythmical prose version. The disorder in the dress is constantly interfering with this feeling we wish to have. Thus reading it as prose, in spite of our knowledge of its being poetry, we are constantly expecting the more logical transitions; and when they are not found, it seems all a disconnected and, sometimes, unmeaning rhapsody. A very simple rhythm, if it be smooth, may give the feeling that should accompany, whilst yet keeping as close to the lexical and grammatical sense as any purely prose translation could do. By this simple outward process, the soul of the reader is set in the right direction. The subjective predominates. He gets into the current of thought and feeling, and the purely emotional transitions become not only easy, but natural. When they occur, they are felt to be something we might expect,—and the mind thus prepared, not only apprehends them at once, but sees in them an exquisite emotional appropriateness. Thus the passage is actually better understood from the very fact of its rhythmical form. In this way a verse translation of a poem in another language, with the same number of words, or with a very small difference, may carry the *whole sense*, that is, both emotion and idea, more surely and more distinctly than any prose version could have done that had been constructed with the utmost regard to lexical accuracy. This may be tested by a comparison which would appeal to every reader's common sense, as well as literary taste. Take Bryant's translation of the *Iliad*. Its blank verse is not only very smooth, as verse, but remarkably faithful. It is an evidence how near one may bring the English to the Greek, and yet preserve a simple though musical metrical form. Let the effect of this be contrasted, not with the overloaded rhymes of Pope, but with the best prose

translation that could be made, having for its aim the utmost lexical accuracy, and availing itself of every help that could be derived from the study of Eustathius, and of all the scholiasts. Certainly, Bryant carries us farther into the very soul of Homer than any such prose translations could possibly do, even though aided by so complete a scholastic apparatus.

From such a view, the Biblical commentator himself, dry as his work generally is, gets a new insight, as it were, by coming into the emotional spirit of the language he is explaining. But all this, it may be said, is interpreting by the imagination; it is letting one's self be led away by a feeling which may, or may not, have come from the passage. There is, indeed, danger of this; but then it may be truly said that a man with no emotion from what he is studying—a man having a mere intellectual interest, or possessed of little or no imagination—can never be a good commentator, or a good translator of Job, or of the Psalms, or of the Hebrew Prophets, or even of Homer. He must certainly fail in what is more essential than any mere grammatical exegesis, most valuable and important as that may be.

Again, there is a great deal of emphasis, and of what may be called emotional or exclamatory power in certain Hebrew words and idioms, which the corresponding words in English, and the nearest English idioms, fail to express. There is needed some interjection, some qualifying particle, which comes in easy and natural when it so comes from the sustained flow of rhythmical feeling instinctively, as it were, selecting the right words. One of the coolest temperament cannot read Job without seeing that there must be in it much of this *post-scenic* language. It may be a tone, a sigh, a pause of silence, an imploring or a deprecating look, a demonstrative gesture, all of them intimated in the words themselves, or revealed in the answers of the disputants who understand their fullest import, and all making up that life-scene, that unmistakable reality, which is insisted on in the *Addenda*, *Excursus* I. and II., pp. 5–6.

It is this consideration to which the translator would appeal as justifying epithets occasionally, though quite rarely, applied by him to Hebrew nouns. In all such cases it will be found that they belong to the emphasis of the passage, and that, without them, the English reader would receive a *deficient idea*, and certainly a *deficient feeling*, of the substantives to which they are attached. Thus "*visions dire*," vii. 14; the epithet is necessary because חזיון means more than *vision* in this place. It is more than the seeing: it is the thing seen—a phantom, a spectre. So תרדמה, iv. 13, rendered "*vision-seeing trance*," is more than any slumber, however deep. Its vision-seeing or clairvoyant nature appears from Gen. ii. 21: Adam's deep sleep; Gen. xv. 12: Abraham's vision-seeing trance; 1 Sam. xx. 12: the sleep that God sent upon Saul. It is used, indeed, of deep slumber generally, but in Job iv. 13 it evidently has this mysterious trance significance which is so unmistakable in the passages referred to. A similar remark applies to those occasional cases where the translator has placed words in brackets, though forming a part of the movement of the line. They denote something quite evidently to be implied, whether as hidden in some emotional particle, or as indicating a thought that has come in during some touching pause of silence, especially in the speeches of Job (see *Addenda* aforesaid, pa. 6), and which, though unexpressed in words, appears in the coloring it gives to what follows as something well understood by the repliants and all who were spectators of the scene.

A few words in regard to the language and style of the Version. Of the first, it may be said that the aim has been to make it as pure Saxon-English as possible. Words of that kind have ever been preferred. Some very plain and even homely expressions have been used, as having all the more force and pathos by reason of their plainness. Much use has also been made of the poetical element of inversion, but not at all, it is thought, beyond the degree of which the English is capable. It has often seemed to the writer that, throughout the English Bible, the translators might have kept much more of this than appears; as in that beautiful example, Acts iii. 6: "Silver and gold have I none, but what I have, that give I unto thee." In this way, whilst making the Scriptures more impressive, and even more clear, they might have enriched our language with vivid forms of speech, which the very reading of the Bible would, long ere this, have completely naturalized, even had they seemed strange, or semi-poetical, in the beginning.

In this matter of style, too, may be mentioned the use of the nominative independent, which is of frequent occurrence in English, especially in animated or poetical English, and is still more marked in the Arabic, where the subject so often stands by itself, as *l'inchoatif*, to use De Sacy's and the native Arabic technic, whilst the pronoun representing it is expressed or included in the form of the verb. It is also quite common in Hebrew, so that whilst it may be used freely in an English translation of any Hebrew sentence containing subject and predicate (*l'énonciatif*), it is actually demanded when the subject stands first,—as, for example, xi. 2:

A flood of words, demands it no reply?

Or, again, where it is the *object* of the verb that is thus treated:

That night! thick darkness seize it.

Other similar features of style, in respect to which pains have been taken, might be mentioned, were it not for the fear of making this *Introduction* too long. There need only be a reference to the pauses and notes of silence introduced in some places, especially in Job's hesitating and panting speeches,—as the whole subject is fully discussed in the *Addenda*, pp. 178, 179, to which the reader is directed.

To the text of the Version there have been added in the margin quite full exegetical notes. These have been intended to explain, not only every departure from the Common English Version, but also every thing in the Version offered that might seem to demand elucidation for the reader, besides a careful presentment of those difficult passages on which all commentators have dwelt, more or less. In this part of the work the author has taken pains to avail himself of the best helps. The old Versions (Greek, Latin, and Syriac) have continually been consulted, the Targum, the Jewish Commentary of RASCHI, the old Commentators as their opinions are given in POOLE'S *Synopsis*, the best of the more modern, such as LUD. DE DIEU, SCHULTENS, UMBREIT, EWALD, DILLMANN, DELITZSCH, SCHLOTTMANN, PAREAU, MERX, DAVIDSON, GOOD, ROSENMUELLER, BARNES, NOYES, together with CONANT and our own ZÖCKLER, who are not the least among them. More or less consulted have been other German commentators, such as HEILIGSTEDT, VAIHINGER, HIRZEL, *et al.* Important aid has also been derived from the French Version of RENAN. To these may be added that immense work, CARYL on Job, in two very large folio volumes. (1650.) This quaint old Puritan Commentator has not been appreciated as he deserves. Equal in Biblical learning to the most learned of an age abounding in such men as USHER, POCOCK, LIGHTFOOT, BOCHART, he excells them all in that spiritual discernment which makes him especially serviceable to those who would obtain the deepest acquaintance with this Book of Job. It is to him not a work of art, not a drama, not a fiction in any sense, but a divinely given case of religious experience. His critical as well as practical remarks are all penetrated with this idea, giving him an insight, even into Hebrew words and idioms, which the learning that lacks such a conviction so often fails to supply.

The translator, moreover, does not hesitate to say that after giving these valuable helps all due attention, he has not wholly rejected his own independent judgment. Often has it been yielded in deference to superior authority and further study. In other cases, however, it is maintained, though always, he thinks, with a becoming diffidence.

The whole is submitted to the reader with the hope that it may be regarded as making some contribution to our Biblical Literature.

T. L.

RHYTHMICAL VERSION

OF THE

BOOK OF JOB.

Chapter I.

1 There was a man in the land of Uz whose name was Job. This man was pure
2 and just, one who feared God and shunned evil. There were born to him seven
3 sons and three daughters. His wealth was seven thousand sheep and goats, and
three thousand camels, and five hundred yoke of oxen, and five hundred she asses,
and a very great household of servants. And this man was great above all the
Sons of the East.
4 Now his sons used[1] to hold a feast, each one of them at his own house, and on
his own day; and they sent invitations to their sisters to eat and drink with them.
5 And it was[2] the way of Job when these festival days came[3] round, that he sent and
purified them. To this end he rose early in the morning, and offered burnt-offer-
ings according to the number of them all; for it was a saying[4] of Job: it may be
that my sons have sinned and cursed[5] God in their hearts. Thus did Job con-
tinually.

[1] Ver. 4. **Used to hold.** הָלְכוּ וְעָשׂוּ, *went and made.* הלך has frequently in Hebrew the force of an auxiliary verb, giving to the verb that follows it the sense of constant or habitual action. Comp. Gen. xxvi 13; Judges iv. 24; 1 Samuel ii. 26; Gen. viii. 3, and many other places. We have a similar idiom in common English: *He went and said.*

[2] Ver. 5. **And it was the way of Job.** "*And it came to pass*" will not do for the rendering of וַיְהִי here, since that would denote only a single event.

[3] Ver. 5. **Came round.** On account of the Hiphil form הִקִּיפוּ, some would make *sons* the subject, giving it a permissive sense, as Conant does: *They let the feast days go round.* There are examples, however, of Hiphil verbs used intransitively, and it may here have the sense of Kal. Isaiah xxix., although the Kal, in its primary idea, seems to have a very different significance namely, that of *cutting*, as in Isaiah x. 34; Job xix. The incongruity of the apparently intransitive Hiphil would probably disappear if we knew the exact connection between the primary and secondary senses of the root. We may still give it something of a Hiphil rendering, and yet keep יְמֵי הַמִּשְׁתֶּה for the subject: When the days *had made* their round—their end or *section.* Or it may borrow its sense from the unused root קוּף, whence תְּקוּפָה, Ps. xix. 7, a *circuit*, or *occursus*, *κατάντημα*, *a meeting*, as the Vulgate and LXX. have it in that place.

[4] Ver. 5. **It was a saying of Job.** The general aspect of the passage demands the frequentative sense for אמר; or it may be rendered *he thought* (אָמַר בְּלִבּוֹ, *He said in his heart*, Gen. xvii. 17; Ps. xiv 1); or it may be thus taken without the ellipsis, like φημὶ in Homer.

[5] Ver. 5. **And cursed God.** This is the old rendering of the Syriac (צהין), favored by the LXX. *κακὰ ἐνενόησαν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν*), although the Vulgate renders it *benedixerunt*, which Luther follows. Junius and Tremellius, *maledixerint*, although in the other place, ii. 9, they very inconsistently render it *benedicendo.* Aside from the strong demands of the context, the argument for the older rendering is found in the analogy of languages. The primary verbal sense of ברך (whatever may be the order of its connection with the noun sense of בֶּרֶךְ, *the knee*) is to *pray.* Hence, in Piel to *bless*, to pray for good, or, as here, for evil, that is, to *curse* (the English word itself, according to Webster, having had a good origin in *cross*—to pray evil in the name, or with the sign, of the cross). In like manner, the corresponding verbs, both in Greek and Latin, *ἀράομαι*, *precor* (the latter with the same radical letters as the Hebrew verb, PRK, BRK) have, also, the two senses of prayer and malediction, although the bad sense, from the greater cursing tendency of the Greeks, is so much more frequent than in Hebrew. So also *κατεύχομαι*, joined with *ἀράομαι*, Æsch. *Sept. Theb.* 633—

οἵας γ' ἀρᾶται καὶ κατεύχεται τύχας.

Hence *ἀρὰς ἀρᾶσθαι*, found frequently (or some similar

6 Now it was the[6] day when the Sons of God came to present themselves before the[7]
7 Lord; and Satan (the Adversary or the Accuser[8]) came also among them. And
the Lord said to Satan, Whence comest thou? And Satan answered the Lord and
8 said: From going to and fro in the earth, and walking up and down[9] in it. And
the Lord said to Satan: Hast thou observed my servant Job, that there is none
like him on the earth, a man pure and just, fearing God and shunning evil?

phrase) in the dramatic poets, may have the benedictory or the maledictory sense. The former is the more ancient (as we have it HERODOTUS i. 132, ἀρᾶσθαι ἀγαθά, and just above in the same section, κατεύχεται εὖ γίνεσθαι), the latter the more common. It is true, that they generally have an object expressed, or a substantive noun, like ἀρὰ ἀρῇ, which seems to determine their application; but then there is the same peculiarity about the noun itself. Thus ἀρὰ more commonly means a *curse*; but it has also the older sense of *blessing* or *prayer*; as in HERODOTUS vi. 63; ἀρὴν ἐποιήσαντο παῖδα γενέσθαι, "they made a *prayer* that he might have a son;" and therefore he was called Demaratus, "the people-prayed-for" king. If the context helps to determine which sense is to be given to the Greek verbs, there may be said to be the same demand of the context in such passages as these in Job and in 1 Kings xxi. 10. At all events, the facility with which these verbs are used in this double way furnishes an argument for those who hold to a similar tendency in Hebrew. It might, perhaps, be thought that, in some of the verbs referred to, the imprecatory force came from the compounded preposition, as in καταράομαι κατεύχομαι, *imprecor*. The preposition, however, only gives direction to the action of the verb, and may be consistent with either sense—blessings *upon*, or curses *at*.

Besides, in the case of the Greek ἀράομαι and the Latin *precor*, the cursing sense occurs, when the context demands it, without any preposition—*bene precari* or *male precari* being equally independent uses. It is worthy of note, too, that, according to LANE, the corresponding Arabic verb in the viii. Conjugation (אתברך) has the sense of *vituperation, reviling, detraction*. There is, moreover, the analogy of other similar words in Latin. *Sacro*, for example, may mean to *consecrate* or to *make accursed*. So *sacer* may mean *holy, sacred*, or *impious, accursed, horrible*. VIRG. *auri sacra fames*, "*accursed hunger for gold*." In this way *sacro* and *exsecror* (*execrate*) come to be used in the same way. The same law of contraries seems to prevail in respect to some other Hebrew words of a similar kind. Thus the verb קָדַשׁ *purus mundus fuit—holy, clean*—and קְדֵשָׁה, *meretrix*, one polluted, *consecrata* in the bad sense of the Latin *sacrata*. So חרם (as a verb, or as a noun) may carry the idea of something *holy, consecrated*, or something *doomed, accursed*, ἀνάθεμα. There is the same equivoque in the Arabic *haram*. It is not without a natural ground, this diversity and almost contrariety of meaning. It comes from the fact, that the feelings of reverence and of *awe*, on the one hand, and of fear, detestation, and even of abhorrence, on the other, do sometimes approach each other. The terms are thus used in respect to things or ideas to which we cannot stand indifferent. This is the case with the idea of a personal God. Fearful as is the thought, yet experience, as well as Scripture, teaches that where there is no love for Him, there must be aversion. Not to bless, as Job does, ver. 21, is to curse.

The argument for the old translation is strengthened by the invalidity of the reasons given for the new. In the first place, there is no evidence that the Hebrew בֵּרֵךְ ever means "to bid farewell," like the Greek χαίρειν, or ἐᾶν χαίρειν, unless this place is found to bear testimony to it. And, secondly, there is but slight evidence that the Greek phrase itself is ever used in malam part m. Its etymological signification, *to rejoice* (like the Latin *vale*, Greek ἔρρωσο, *be well, be strong*), is out of harmony with such a use. It is a bidding *farewell*, and may thus come to mean abandoning, giving up, especially when connected with ἐάω, but ever with sorrow, never with bitterness. It does not mean to *renounce* or *denounce* in this harsh way. And if it did, that would be so near to cursing as to take away all its value as an explanation of the seeming difficulty. Such a formula would be most peculiarly inappropriate to the charge against Naboth, 1 Kings xxi. 10, "Thou hast said *farewell to the king*," as a mode of *renouncing*. There is not a particle of evidence in the Old Testament that treason or rebellion was ever expressed in that way. The Vulgate and the LXX. in rendering it literally εὐλόγηκας and *benedixisti. thou hast blest the king*, either misunderstood it or regarded it as a sneering irony on the part of the witnesses. Here, too (1 Kings xxi. 10), the faithful Syriac renders it *cursed* (צחי נבות). Profanity of some kind, some evil speaking, careless or presumptuous speaking about God (*mala dictio*) would be the sin the young men would be most likely to fall into when heated by wine; and this was the very thing that made Job so solicitous about them, even as he was ever solicitous for the honor of God whom "he feared." It shows, too, how justly he was entitled to the character given to him as one who not only feared God, but shunned evil—everything that had the appearance of evil, or that might lead to it. See his own description of the highest human wisdom, xxviii. 28. See also the remarks on this touching recital of his God-fearing, paternal solicitude, EXCURSUS iv., p. .

[6] Ver. 6. **The day.** The article, as CONANT says, denotes here a particular time, as set for this purpose. The rendering, therefore, of E. V., *there was a day*, called for amendment.

[7] Ver. 6. **The Lord.** The translator has followed E. V. in this rendering, instead of the rendering *Jehovah* which *Conant* gives whenever יהוה occurs. His is the more faithful translation undoubtedly, and yet it was something entitled to a better name than superstition which led our old translators to avoid the frequent mention of this highest of the divine appellations. We can hardly condemn the Jews for carrying the feeling still farther, even to the avoidance of the writing it, except in copies of the Holy Scriptures. It is the great and ineffable name, and the effect must be bad if its pronunciation is repeated everywhere in the numerous cases of its occurrence throughout the Scriptures. What would make it sound worse is the fact of its being the proper name of Deity, as it were, in distinction from others which are descriptive. If used thus, it would come to sound like ZEUS in Greek, JUPITER in Latin or ORMUZD among the Persians, or THOR of the Scandinavian mythology, and that is the reason, doubtless, why the scoffing infid ls are so fond of giving the name in full in their offensive and irreligious caricatures. The thought is of importance at the present time, when Bible revisions are so much talked of. Dr. CONANT'S, or the new Baptist version, is, in many respects, an improvement on the old, and we can only hope, therefore, that, before it goes into common use in that denomination, there may be a change back to the old method. Still more exceptionable are the new modes of writing and pronouncing this sacred name such as *Jahveh, Jehveh, etc.* Etymologically, they may be more correct than that given by the vowels long attached to it; but it disturbs the sacred feeling that inheres in the name as pronounced on solemn occasions, and as it appears in the few cases of its expression by our old translators. Some of the German Rationalists seem to delight in being especially offensive in this way. It occurs a number of times in this Prologue, and comes again in the Epilogue, or the two closing chapters, but in the dramatic, or spoken part, it occurs but once, xii. 9, and that in a declaration more than usually solemn and emphatic. If we regard them as actual discourses, it is evident that the speakers shunned the utterance of the name. If it is a poetical invention merely, then the writer must have felt that its frequent introduction in the dialogue parts would have been a violation of a sacred dramatic propriety. There is one occasion, as it occurs in the Prologue, in which it was deemed best, by the present translator, to give the name itself. It is in Job's most solemn act of submission, ch. i. 21, where strong emotion causes him to break out into the chanting style.

[8] Ver. 6. **The Accuser—the Adversary.** The meaning of the name is given here on the ground that it would be suggestive to the reader in those passages of the dialogue where Job speaks of "his enemy," and would give a deeper significance to what he says, xix. 25, of his *Goel, Avenger, Redeemer*.

[9] Ver. 7. **Going to and fro—walking up and down.** Dr. CONANT'S version, *roaming over—walking about*, is undoubtedly more in accordance with modern speech, and therefore, an improvement; but the present translator must confess his preference of the old English, as more graphic. Compare the language, 1 Pet. v. 8: "The Accuser, like a roaring lion, *walks about* seeking whom he may devour." It must have come from the Apostle's familiarity with this language in Job.

9 Then Satan answered the Lord and said: Doth Job fear God for nought?
10 Hast thou not made a hedge[10] about him, and about his house, and about all that
he hath on every side. Thou hast blessed the work of his hands: his wealth has
11 spread abroad in the land. But put forth thy hand now and touch all that he
12 hath, and see if he will not curse thee to thy face. And the Lord said to Satan:
Behold, all that he hath is in thy power; only against his person put not forth thy
hand. So Satan went forth from the presence of the Lord.
13 Now it was the day that his sons and his daughters were eating and drinking
14 wine in the house of their brother, the first-born. And there came a messenger to
Job and said: The cattle were ploughing, the she asses were feeding beside them,
15 when the Sabæans fell upon them and took them; The servants also have they
smitten with the edge of the sword; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee.
16 While he was still speaking, there came another and said: The fire of God fell
from heaven, and burned the flocks and the young men, and consumed them; and
I only am escaped alone to tell thee.
17 While he was still speaking, there came another, and said: The Chaldæans
made three bands, and set upon the camels and took them. The servants also
have they slain with the sword; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee.
18 While he was still speaking, there came another and said: Thy sons and thy
daughters were eating and drinking wine in the house of their brother, the first-
19 born. And behold, there came a great wind from the direction of the wilderness,
and struck upon the four corners of the house, so that it fell upon the young
people, and they are dead; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee.
20 Then Job arose and rent his garment, and shaved his head; and he fell to the
earth and worshipped. And he said:

21 All naked from my mother's womb I came,
And naked there shall I again return.
Jehovah gave, Jehovah takes away;
Jehovah's name be blessed.

22 In all this Job sinned not, nor charged cruelty[11] upon God.

[10] Ver. 10. **Made a hedge about him.** Among the striking epithets which the Greek poets affix to the name of the supreme god Zeus, no one is more suggestive of certain scriptural ideas than that of Ζεὺς Ἑρκεῖος (derived Latin *Jupiter Herceus*) literally, "the God of the household," of *the enclosure*" (from ἕρκος, a *fence, hedge*, or *wall*)—the "God of families," of the domestic relations. It is thus the style of Scripture not to shrink from placing side by side, as it were, the two extremes in the divine idea: the "God Eternal, Almighty, Most High" (see the names *El Olam*, *El Shaddai*, *El Elyon*, as they occur in Genesis) in close connection with epithets denoting patrial, local, and even family relations. He is the God of the universe, *παντοκράτωρ*, and at the same time, a *θεὸς πατρώϊος*, God of Israel, the God of His people, of his elect, in a closer sense than was ever dreamed of in any Grecian mythology. This epithet is a gem from the ancient mine of ideas. The thought it carries is from the patriarchal days. "Thou hast made a hedge about him and about his house, and all that he hath." God does not deny what Satan says, although, for his own transcending reasons, He gives him permission to enter that sacred enclosure, and lay it waste for a season, that it may be restored to a state of more perfect security. He is called Ζεὺς Ἑρκεῖος, say the Scholiasts, because his statue stood in the ἕρκος, and that these frigid souls, and many modern critics with them, think to be enough. They never think of asking the question that lies back of this: why was his statue placed in that spot? There was in it the same idea that is represented in those words of the Latin poet:

"Sacra Dei, sanctique patres"—

so pregnant with a meaning of which he himself perhaps had a very inadequate conception,—the sacred *family idea*, now so fiercely assailed in some quarters—those holy domestic relations so closely allied to religion, and where Righteousness lingers last when taking its departure from the earth:

"extrema per illos
"Justitia excedens terris vestigia fecit."

[11] Ver. 22. **Cruelty, תִּפְלָה: enormity.** Any thing *abnormal, anomalous, inexplicable.* See the note on the word, ch. xxiv. 12.

Chapter II.

1 Again it was the day when the Sons of God came to present themselves before
the Lord; and Satan came also among them to present himself before the Lord.
2 Then said the Lord to Satan: Whence comest thou? And Satan answered the
Lord and said: From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and
3 down in it. Then said the Lord to Satan: Hast thou observed my servant Job,
that there is none like him in the earth, a man pure and just, fearing God and
shunning evil? And still he holds fast his integrity, though thou didst move me
against him to destroy him without cause.
4 And Satan answered the Lord and said: Skin after skin[1]; yea all that a man
5 hath will he give for his life. But put forth thy hand now, and touch his bone;
6 touch his flesh; and see if he will not curse thee to thy face! And the Lord said
to Satan: Behold, he is in thy hand, only spare his life.
7 Then Satan went forth from the presence of the Lord, and smote Job with a
8 grievous sore, from the sole of his foot to his crown. And he took a potsherd to
9 scrape himself therewith, as he sat among the ashes. Then said his wife to him:
10 Dost thou still hold fast thine integrity? Curse[2] God and die. But Job said to
her: Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaks. Shall we, then, accept[3]
good at the hands of God, and shall we not accept evil? In all this Job sinned not
with his[4] lips.
11 Now three friends of Job heard of all this evil that was come upon him. And
they came, each one from his place, Eliphaz the Temanite, and Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite, for they made an appointment together to go
12 and mourn with him, and to comfort him. And they lifted up their eyes afar off,
and knew him not; and they wept aloud, and rent, each one, his mantle, and

[1] Ver. 4. **Skin after Skin.** Heb. עוֹר בְּעַד עוֹר, or *skin for skin*, if we wish to take בעד in the same way as at the end of the verse, בעד נפשו, *for his life.* But it comes to the same thing. From the sense of *after*, which certainly belongs to בעד, and, in Arabic, is the prominent sense, comes that of *exchange*, one thing after another, or taking the place of another; the preposition coming before either the price or the thing exchanged. But what is the meaning of it? It would require a large space to give the different views that have been entertained. The reader will find a very full list of them, as given by Dr. Conant: Skin for skin—skin of another for skin of one's self—skin for the body—skin for skin, a proverbial saying, *like for like*—skin after skin, as Schultens explains it: that is, a willingness to be flayed over and over again, that is, figuratively, to be stripped of all his possessions, *etc.* It seems strange that none of them seek the explanation of the language in any thing beyond itself. After so much discussion, it is with diffidence the translator makes the suggestion that the whole difficulty is cleared up by simply adverting to the words עַצְמוֹ and בְּשָׂרוֹ ("his bone and his flesh") in the next verse. עֶצֶם *bone* is used for the very substance of a thing, in distinction from its outside, or incidental properties. See Exodus xxiv. 12. So גֶּרֶם, sometimes. But take it here for *bone*, as something more interior than the skin. or as containing the medulla, or as connected with the flesh which has in it more of the life, the *feeling*, than the skin, and we have just the comparison desired. It is the interior flesh. the *quick* flesh, as contrasted with the less sensible skin. So in xix. 25, it is the contrast between the raw flesh to which he points (זֹאת), as yet remaining, and the skin which the crawling worms, bred by his disease, had already nearly devoured. The comparison seems obvious. The skin is outside to the bone, and to the quick or tender flesh. It represents the outside goods, τὰ ἔξω, such as property and even children. These may be stripped off, like one cuticle after another, but the interior life, the bone and the quick-flesh, is not reached. Touch that and see if he will not cry out in a different strain. Satan wanted to try the effect of severe bodily pain. He knew how intolerable it was, and that other afflictions, though deemed greater, perhaps, when estimated as matter of loss, could more easily be borne. The history shows that it was not the fear of death that was so terrible to Job, since he sometimes expresses a desire to die. נַפְשׁוֹ then, here rendered the life (end of ver. 4) is not life, as *existence*, but life as *feeling*, feeling of severe pain. At the end of ver. 6, the context demands the other sense. He will give any thing, says Satan, to get relief from that when it becomes excruciating. See Remarks on this idea of unendurable pain in the *Introduction on the Theism of the Book*, p. 28.

[2] Ver. 9. The reasons for this rendering are still stronger here than in the other passage, i. 5. The wife's vehemence, and apparent bitterness, demand the strongest expression.

[3] Ver. 10. **Accept.** This is a more suitable word, and denotes more than *receive*. The latter word does not determine the manner, being, like the Hebrew לקח. קַבֵּל occurs in Daniel and Ezra. and may be called an Aramaism; but such examples, as has been fully shown, prove little or nothing in respect to the date of the Book. There are still more decided Aramaisms in Genesis and Judges. There are reasons, in some cases, for regarding them as marks of antiquity rather than of the contrary.

[4] Ver. 10. **With his lips.** The Jewish commentators infer from this that while Job preserved correctness of speech, he was already sinning. or beginning to feel a want of submission, in *his heart*. But there hardly seems any good warrant for this. See *Int. Theism*, p. 28.

13 sprinkled dust upon their heads toward heaven. And they sat down with him
upon the earth, seven days and seven nights; and none spake a word to him; for
they saw that his pain[5] was very great.

[5] Ver. 13. **Pain was very great.** כְּאֵב, means, properly, *bodily pain*, although used sometimes for affliction generally, or *dolor cordis*, the aching of the soul (see Isa. lxv. 14). But even this is on account of the *dolor corporis*, which may become so great as to overpower everything else. This has not been sufficiently attended to by commentators. See remarks *Int. Theism*, p. 28, *etc.* Job's grievous cry, ch. iii., was simply the expression of this intolerable pain, which the fell disease was bringing upon him. Satan was now touching his *bone* and his *quick-flesh*, instead of his *skin*, that is, any outward good. See Note on ver. 4. The conduct of the friends shows this. Had it been mental sorrow alone, however severe, there would have been no reason why they should not have spoken to him. But to a man writhing in such extreme bodily anguish, speech would be useless, if not an aggravation.

Chapter III.

1 After this Job opened his mouth and cursed his day.
2 And Job began and said,

3 Perish the day when I was to be[1] born,
The night that said,[2] a man child is conceived.
4 That day! O be it darkness evermore;
Eloah never seek it from above,
Nor ever shine the light upon its face.
5 Let darkness and the death shade call[3] it back;
Dense clouds upon it make their fixed abode;
And dire eclipses[4] fill it with affright.

6 That night! thick darkness take it for its own.
In the year's reckoning may it never joy;
Nor come into the number of the months.

7 Lo! let that night be barren evermore,
And let no sound of joy be heard therein.
8 Who curse the day, let them forever curse it,—
They who are doomed[5] to rouse Leviathan.

[1] Ver. 3. אִוָּלֶד בּוֹ. **When I was to be born.**—We follow Raschi, who gives the future here its prospective significance. The post-anticipating imagination goes back of birth, and takes its stand before the coming event, as though deprecating, *praying against*, its appearance. "*The day on which I was going to be born*," he renders it ואז לא הייתי נולד "*and was then not yet born.*" Unless there had been some such idea as this it is not easy to see why the preterite would not have been used, as it is in the parallel passage, Jerem. xx. 14: אָרוּר הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר יֻלַּדְתִּי בּוֹ, "cursed be the day in which I *was* born."

[2] Ver. 3. **The night that said.**—More grammatical as well as more significant than our English Version. Night is personified. This is now generally acknowledged.

[3] Ver. 5. **Call it back.**—Umbreit, *einlösen*, *redeem it*, *buy it back*. Darkness and *Tzalmazeth* are called upon to take it back as something which had been loaned or mortgaged—reclaim it as their own—a terrific image.—The other sense of גאל, namely, that of *staining*, which some give it here, will not do at all.

[4] Ver. 5. **Dire eclipses.**—כִּמְרִירֵי. *Patach* shortened to *Hirek* in the construct. state. The other rendering makes כ comparative, and takes מריר as equal to מאריר *Hiph. part.* of ארר: *like those who curse the day*. This, however, would make what follows in ver. 8 but a tame repetition, which is not likely. From כמר we get the sense of *convolution*, *wrapping* or rolling together. Hence the image of any great obscuration, *veiling* or *darkening* of the heavens.

[5] Ver. 8. **Doomed.**—The primary sense of עתיד is a *near futurity*, something *impending*, hence *prompt*, *prepared*, and from that the sense of *skilled* which, however, does not occur elsewhere in Hebrew, and seems to have been made by Gesenius and others, for this one place. The primary sense, given nearly in E. V., will do here, and, in connection with it, it is easy to take Leviathan in its usual sense of some great monster, and the whole passage as denoting persons exposed to some imminent danger, or in the extreme of misery: *let it have the cursing of such*—that is, the deepest cursing. Delitzsch, and others, refer it to a superstition built upon the fable of the dragon swallowing the moon in an eclipse. *Those who rouse Leviathan* are enchanters, who, in this way, are supposed to produce eclipses. It seems very far-fetched, and has about it an aspect of artificiality quite alien to the deep passionateness of the passage. There is, besides, not the least evidence of any such superstition among the Jews or the ancient Arabians.

9 Be dark its twilight stars.
For light let it look forth, and look in vain;
Nor may it ever see the eyelids of the dawn.
10 For that it did not shut the womb when I was born,
Nor hide the coming sorrow from mine eyes.

11 Why at the birth did I not die—
When from the womb I came—and breathe my last?
12 Why were the nursing[6] knees prepared?
And why the breasts that I should suck?
13 For now in silence had I lain me down;
Yea, I had slept and been at rest
14 (With kings and legislators of the earth—
The men who build their mouldering[7] monuments—
15 Or princes once enriched with gold,
Their homes with treasure filled),
16 Or, like the hidden birth,[8] had never lived;
Like still-born babes that never saw the light.

17 For there the wicked cease from troubling;
There the weary are at rest.
18 There lie the captives all at ease;
The driver's voice they hear no more.
19 The small and great alike are there;
The servant from his master free.

20 O why does He[9] give light to one in pain?
Or life to the embittered soul?
21 To those who long for death that never comes;
Who seek for it beyond the search of treasure;
22 Who joy to exultation,—yea,
Are very glad, when they can find the grave.

23 [The grave![10]] 'tis for the man whose way is hid,—
Whom God hath hedged around.
24 For still my groaning goes before my food,
My moans like water are poured forth.
25 For I did greatly fear,[11] and it hath come;
Yea, it hath come to me, the thing that was my dread:

[6] Ver. 12. **The nursing knees.**—An affecting image of the preparation made for the coming birth. The tenderest care becomes the object of the direst imprecation.

[7] Ver. 14. **Mouldering Monuments.**—חרבות. DELITZSCH, *ruins*. So UMBREIT. Monuments so called because now abandoned to neglect,—mouldering like the memories of those who built them. There is here a bitter irony, as UMBREIT says.

[8] Ver. 16. **Had never lived.**—לא אחיה in sense connects back with 'ישנתי', ver. 13, and what intervenes may be regarded as parenthetical comparisons: The first או, ver. 15, is simply connective of vers. 14 and 15.

[9] Ver. 20. **Why does He?**—God is evidently the subject of יִתֵּן. It is as though Job feared to name him otherwise than by the pronoun. There is no need of taking it passively, as in E. V., and thereby destroying much of the power and pathos of the passage. Such avoidance in Hebrew of the direct naming of the subject almost always denotes something fearful in the thought of the *act* or the *agent*.

[10] Ver. 23. Were it not for the Masoretic accentuation and division, קָבֶר, end of ver. 22, might be taken with the clause that follows: *the grave is for the man, etc.* In that case, however, the preceding verb would have needed an objective suffix representing מָוֶת, ver. 21. The *force* of the word קָבֶר may, at all events, be regarded as carried over into the following verse, as the still sounding refrain: *the grave—it is for the man whose way is hid, etc.*

[11] Ver. 25. **Did greatly fear.**—The language is soliloquizing. It may be regarded as a *resuming*, after a pause in which there occurs to the mind of Job this silent protest, anticipating, as it were, something of the kind of charge

26 For I was not at ease, nor felt secure,
Nor rested thoughtlessly—yet trouble came.

that might, perhaps, be brought against him by the friends. I was not presumptuous, he seems to say; this trouble could not have come as a punishment for any such feeling. He had thought of adversity in the midst of his prosperity; "his heart had not been haughty, nor his eyes lofty." He may refer to a fear he had had of this awful disease, the elephantiasis, which had, at last, come upon him. It is not easy to discover the reason why some commentators turn these distinct preterite verbs of fear, פחדתי, יגרתי, into presents, as though he then feared some other terrible thing as coming upon him. So DELITZSCH renders it, although the verbs in the next verse, having precisely the same form, and standing in precisely the same grammatical connection (namely, שלותי, שקטתי, *etc.*), he takes in the past. It seems like treating the Hebrew tenses as though they could be made to mean anything which a commentator might wish to bring out.

CHAPTER IV.

1 Then answered Eliphaz, the Temanite, and said:

2 A word, should we attempt, wouldst thou be grieved?
Yet who from speaking can refrain?
3 Lo many hast thou taught,
And strengthened oft the feeble hands.
4 The faltering steps thy speech hath rendered firm,
The sinking knees made strong.
5 But now to thee it comes, and thou art weary;
It toucheth thee, and thou art all amazed.

6 Is not thy pious[1] fear thy confidence?
Is not thy hope the pureness of thy ways?
7 Call now to mind; when has the guiltless perished?[2]
And where were just men hopelessly destroyed?
8 It is as I have seen, that they who evil plough—
Who mischief sow, they ever reap the same.
9 By the breath of God these perish utterly;
By the blast of his fierce wrath are they consumed.
10 (Hushed is) the lion's cry, the schachal's roar;
The strong young lion's teeth are crushed.
11 The fierce old lion perishes from want;
The lion's whelps are scattered far and wide.[3]

12 To me, at times,[4] there steals a warning[5] word;
Mine ear its whisper seems to catch.

[1] Ver. 6. **Pious fear.** The epithet is used in order to give the distinctive meaning. יראת יהוה is the Hebrew phrase for *religion*, and becomes used elliptically.

[2] Ver. 7. The emphasis here is on the verb, אבד and נכחדו, both strong words. The first might be rendered *lost*, *utterly* gone. The second is well expressed, in the English version, by the Jewish phrase, *cut off*. Instead of as yet charging Job with crimes, or even insinuating them, this language is meant to be encouraging. "The just, such as thou claimest to be, and as we believe thee to be, are never utterly *lost*, *destroyed*, *cut off* from God's people. Therefore, hope thou for healing and restoration."

[3] Vers. 10 and 11. MERX puts these verses in the margin of his text, in smaller letters, and regards them as a displacement. They certainly have that look, unless we may regard them as a specimen of the way in which animated Arabian speakers run out their comparisons, as Homer sometimes does, until they seem to lose sight of the primary idea. What seems, too, to favor this view of MERX is the apparent lack of any verb, or verbs, for the nouns in the first clause, unless they are connected with נִתָּעוּ, which seems only applicable to the teeth. The translator has endeavored to supply this by the words in brackets. Such ellipses seem allowable when it is easy to understand a verb agreeable to the nature of the nouns, and suiting the context. It may, however, be regarded as a case of zeugma.

[4] Ver. 12 Although the Hebrew here is so very short in expression וְאֵלַי דָּבָר יְגֻנָּב, only three words, the translator would defend his version as neither superfluous nor deficient. The latter charge would seem to be against the omission of the conjunction; but ו, here, is only a transition particle. It connects nothing, and, therefore, as any full English conjunction would only encumber the thought, the ו is best rendered by being left out (see note on the omission of the conjunction xiv. 2). The Pual יְגֻנָּב is rendered deponently; the passive form denoting merely ease or gentleness of motion, as though from no agency of the subject. Literally *was stolen*; but the idea is evidently the same as we sometimes express by the active *steal*, as in Milton's lines:

A soft and solemn *breathing* sound
Rose like the scent of rich distilled perfumes,
And *stole* upon the air.

13 In troubled thoughts from spectres of the night,
When falls on men the vision-seeing[6] trance,—
14 And fear has come, and trembling dread,
And made my every bone to thrill with awe,[7]—
15 'Tis then before me stirs a breathing form ;[8]
O'er all my flesh it makes the hair rise up.[9]
16 It stands ;[10] no face[11] distinct can I discern ;
An outline is before mine eyes ;
Deep silence ![12] then a voice I hear :
17 Is mortal[13] man more just than God ?
Is boasting[14] man more pure than He who made him ?
18 In His own servants, lo, He trusteth not,
Even on His angels doth He charge[15] defect.
19 Much more to them who dwell in homes of clay,
With their foundation laid in dust,
And crumbled like the moth.

At times. This is justified, and even demanded in order to give the true conception of the future form in יְגֻנַּב. It is the *frequentative* future, denoting repeated happening, a coming of things, one after another, and therefore future to each other as a *picture*, though all past as a *narration*. The pictorial Hebrew language uses this future in prose, sometimes, as well as in poetry. There is an example of it, ch. i. 5: "Thus did Job continually," ככה יעשה איוב (thus *would* he do, כל הימים "all the days"—*time after time*). We may render it by a past tense; but there is a subjective or relative futurity in it. There is, moreover, something in this form, as here used, that gives an anticipatory, a looking-out sense to the whole passage. It is painted as something *coming on*, as though the speaker placed himself *in medias res*, or rather back of all, and regarded the events as they appeared to him in each time of his having this clairvoyant experience; for the whole style of the language seems to convey such an idea; as in the case of the δαιμόνιον of Socrates which so *frequently* appeared to him, though not always, perhaps, in the same way. The plural nouns in the first clause of ver. 13 confirm this view: "in *seasons* of serious thought—in *visions* of the night;" as though it had often happened.

To render יְגֻנַּב in the past, without any *wau conversive*, or any affecting particle, or any thing in the context to justify it, seems very arbitrary, besides overlooking the whole spirit of the passage. As the formal future ("*will steal*") would not suit our idiom, or our Occidental modes of expressing relative time, the best thing we can do is to imitate the pictorial manner by putting it in the present, with some word to denote its repetitive idea as an *experience*, and something to express the subjective anticipatory feeling. To this latter service, no word is better adapted than our word *seems*, as used in vers. 12 and 15.

Similar remarks are applicable to the futures that follow, namely, יַחֲלֹף, a peculiarly visionary word, and תְּסַמֵּר, ver. 15, and יַעֲמֹד, ver. 16. The præterites mingled with them (קְרָאַנִי and הִפְחִיד) have more of the *narrative* in distinction from the *descriptive* style; but these, too, may be regarded as subjective retro-transitions, or shiftings of scenic event. It may be maintained, also, that they are all affected by the peculiar subjective character given to the whole passage by the starting future יְגֻנַּב, ver. 12.

[5] Ver. 12. **Warning word.**—דָּבָר, here, has its sense *oraculum*, as in Num. xxiii. 5, 16, and frequently in the Prophets.

[6] Ver. 13. **Vision-seeing.**—On the propriety of this word, see remarks Int. Rhyth. Ver., p. 51.

[7] Ver. 14. **Thrill with awe.** הִפְחִיד is an intensive verb of fear, but does not, of itself, mean *to shake*, as E. V. renders it. The Hiphil form makes it here peculiarly strong.

[8] Ver. 15. **A breathing form.** Some render רוּחַ here a *spirit* (a *spectre*, *phantasm*); others simply *a wind*. The rendering above given combines both ideas—not for the sake of compromise, but because it is supposed to be most descriptive of the fact intended: a *stirring*, or movement in the air, produced by a spiritual presence, thus, as it were, taking form and position for the sense, or, in this way, announcing itself. Walter Scott may not have thought of Job, but he has something of the same conception in respect to the effect produced by the presence of spirits, when William of Deloraine disturbed the grave of the wizard. Michael Scott (*Lay of the Last Minstrel*, *Cant.* ii. 16):

> Strange sounds along the chancel past,
> The banners *waved without a blast*.

We have, along with this, that most peculiar verb חלף, generally denoting some mysterious, indescribable change. The simplest word, however, answers the purpose here. It was a *stirring* in the air, just making, or seeming to make, itself perceptible to the sense.

[9] Ver. 15. **Made my hair rise up:** תְּסַמֵּר. There is no reason why this Piel verb should not have its transitive sense, though most commentators render it intransitively, making *hair* the subject. If taken transitively, רוח (*wind* or *spirit*) is the subject: or the feminine may denote a general or indefinite subject, *the event itself*.

[10] Ver. 16. **It stands.** יַעֲמֹד—takes position after the breathing motion, and before the announcement.

[11] **No face.** מַרְאֵה, *aspectus*, *visage*, something that has features. It is a more distinct word than תְּמוּנָה in the next clause, and makes a contrast with it stronger than the words *form* and *image* as used by E. V. and Conant. It is the mere *outline* without any *look*, or any internal lineaments.

[12] Ver. 16. **Deep silence!** דממה might, perhaps, be taken interjectionally, as we sometimes use the noun silence for *hush!* as though the narrator, in his vivid apprehension, is carried back, and loses himself in the scene: "Hush! 'tis a voice I hear!" or, am *about to hear* (subjective future אֶשְׁמָע).

[13] Ver. 17. The announcement of the Spirit is put in capitals; but it is not certain where it ends, or where Eliphaz resumes his moralizing. Ver. 19, beginning with אַף, looks as though it might be the application that the speaker makes of the Spirit's message, which either stops here or goes through the chapter.

[14] Ver. 17. **Boasting man.** The epithet is used to mark the contrast intended between אֱנוֹשׁ, *weak man*, *mortal man*, and גֶּבֶר, *strong man*, *hero*, ἀνήρ, *vir*.

[15] Ver. 18. **Defect:** תָּהֳלָה, *ignorance*.

[16] Ver. 19. לִפְנֵי ; justly regarded by Conant and others as comparative.

20 From morn till night they're stricken down,
Without regard they perish utterly.
21 Their cord[17] of life, is it not torn away?
They die—still lacking[18] wisdom.

[17] Ver. 21. **Their cord of life.** יִתְרָם בָּם. This rendering is adopted by the most modern commentators. It gives us the same image as the mournful language of Hezekiah, Isa. xxxviii. 12, מִדַּלָּה יְבַצְּעֵנִי. Life, as a cord or thread, is a common figure in many languages.

[18] Ver. 21. **Still lacking wisdom.** וְלֹא בְחָכְמָה literally, *but not in wisdom, or with wisdom.* It may be taken as referring to the deep wisdom of God, Job xxviii. 13—"not found in the land of *the living*," that is, among mortal men at all. Or it may be referred to the highest wisdom of which man is capable, "*the fear of God*," xxviii. 28, but which comparatively few men possess.

It is not exactly certain where the metaphor ends. Critics of the Lowthian school might deem this a fault. In the sacred writings, however, metaphors are not employed for embellishment. It may be thought, too, that in this case the effect is strengthened by the very uncertainty. We hardly know where the moth ends and the man begins, or where the one fades away into the other.

CHAPTER V.

1 Call now. Does any answer thee?
To whom among the Holy dost thou turn?
2 Grief slays the foolish man;
It is the simple one whom anger kills.
3 I've seen myself the foolish[1] taking root;
But soon I cursed his home.
4 His sons, from safety far removed,
Are trampled in the gate—no helper near.
5 His harvest doth the hungry man devour;
Even from the thorns[2] he seizes it;
Whilst thirsty robbers swallow up his wealth.
6 Be sure that evil comes not from the dust,
Nor trouble grows as herbage from the ground.
7 Ah no![3] Man's woe is from his birth.
Thence rises it as rise the children of the flame.

8 To God then, surely, would I seek;
To God would I commit my trust;
9 To God whose works are vast, his ways unsearchable,
His wonders numberless;

[1] Ver. 3. **The foolish.** אֱוִיל here, if taken in the milder yet still morally culpable sense of *foolish*, may be personally applicable to Job for his violent outcry, although Eliphaz does not sufficiently consider, or understand, his extreme bodily anguish. In the harsher sense of great criminality, such as seems to be denoted in the description following, we cannot regard them as imputing great crime to Job, or holding him out as a fit subject for such a retribution. The controversy has not yet come to that, and such a sudden and unwarranted imputation upon one who had been known as "sincere and upright, one who feared God and eschewed evil," even as God Himself describes him, would certainly be a gross dramatic inconsistency, to say the least. Job's outcry astonishes them. Whether rightly or not, they understand him as implying that God is unjust, that He even favors the wicked, or, at least, that He has no regard, in His providential dealings, to the character or destiny of men. It is a defence of God against such a supposed charge rather than an attack upon Job personally. In this idea we find a key to much that is afterwards said, though it must be admitted that as the dispute grows warm there comes more and more of personal crimination.

[2] Ver. 5. **Even from the thorns.** This intensive rendering is demanded by the union of the prepositions אֶל and מִן—*to* and *from. They glean close*, even the stray heads of grain that grow among the thorns. צַמִּים is best made here from צמם with the sense of צמא *to thirst* (ZÖCKLER, UMBREIT, EWALD, MERX). One version has *robber*, with little or no authority, unless regarded as metaphorical from the idea of the *thirsty*, with which we have combined it in the version above. DILLMANN, DAVIDSON, CONANT, render it *the snare*, as in xviii. 9, though it seems quite forced here, and entirely out of harmony with שָׁאַף, to *gape* or *pant after*. The VULG. has *armatus* for robber. The Syriac renders it *thirsty*, which certainly seems to make the clearest contrast with hungry (רָעֵב), and therefore to be preferred notwithstanding xviii. 9.

[3] Ver. 7. **Ah, no!** כִּי is not only strongly adversative here, but evidently implies a negative; *οὐ μὴν ἀλλά.* **Children of the flame**; literal rendering of בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף, whether regarded as metaphorical of *sparks*, or of ravenous *birds*, as GESENIUS and others take it.

10 Who giveth rain upon the earth,
And sendeth waters o'er the fields.
11 The lowly ones he sets on high;
The mourning souls in safety are exalted.
12 He foils the cunning in their vain device;
Their hands are powerless to work reality.[4]
13 He snares the wise in their own craftiness;
Whilst the dissembler's plot is hurried on to ruin.
14 These are the men who meet the darkness in the day;
Who grope at highest noon as in the night.
15 God rescues from the sword, from their devouring mouth,
Yea, from the very hand, so strong, He saves the poor.
16 And thus the weak has hope;
And foul injustice shuts her greedy mouth.

17 O blessed is the man whom God reproves;
The Almighty's chastening, therefore, spurn thou not.
18 'Tis true he woundeth, yet he bindeth up.
He smiteth, yet 'tis his own hand that heals.
19 In troubles six will he deliver thee;
In seven—still no harm shall touch thy soul.
20 In famine, he from death[5] will thee redeem,—
In war, from the sword's edge.
21 From the tongue's smiting thou art hidden safe;
Nor shalt thou fear war's wasting when it comes.
22 At devastation and at famine shalt thou laugh;
Of forest beasts[6] thou shalt not be afraid.
23 For with the very stones hast thou a covenant;
All creatures of the field hold peace with thee.
24 So shalt thou know thy tabernacle safe;
Thine household muster, and find nothing gone.[7]
25 Then shalt thou learn how numerous thy seed,—
Thine offspring as the earth's green growing herb.
26 And thou thyself, in ripened age, unto thy grave shalt come,
As sheaf that in its season to the garner mounts.

Lo this; we've pondered well; this is our thought.
O hear and know it; take it to thyself.

[4] Ver. 12. **Reality.** תושיה. See Note 7, vi. 13.

[5] Ver. 20. **Death** here is represented as a tyrant or a conqueror, and therefore there is used the word פדה *to redeem.*

[6] Ver. 22. **Forest Beasts:** חית הארץ, *beasts of the earth;* wild beasts in distinction from חית השדה, *beasts of the field*, or domestic animals.

[7] Ver. 24. לא תחטא. E. V., *not sin.* Primary sense here: not *miss.*

CHAPTER VI.

1 Then Job replied

2 O could my grief be weighed,
And poised[1] against it, in the scale, my woe!
3 For now it would be heavier than the sand;
And thence it comes, my incoherent[2] speech.
4 For Shaddai's arrows are within my flesh;
Their poison drinketh up my soul;
God's terrors stand arrayed before my face.

5 Brays the wild ass when the green herb is nigh?
Or lows the ox when fodder is before him?
6 Unsalted, tasteless—how can it be eaten?
What relish is there in the white of eggs?[3]
7 [So with your words]. My soul refuses taste.
'Tis food[4] I loathe.

8 O that my prayer were heard;
That God would grant the thing for which I long.
9 Let him consent and crush me down;
Let loose his hand and cut[5] my thread of life.
10 For here would be my comfort still,
That I could yet endure,[6] though HE spare not—
The Holy one, whose word I've not denied.
11 But what then is my strength, that I should hope?
And what mine end that I be patient still?
12 My strength! is it the strength of stones?
Or is my flesh of brass?
13 Is not my help within me gone,
And driven from me life's reality?[7]

14 Unto the faint, love still is due from friends,[8]
Even though he had the fear of God forsaken

[1] Ver. 2. **Poised.** ישׁאו, implying weight—*lifting up*, so as to hang in free suspension. יחד here may refer to the grief and suffering laid *together*, or as denoting coincidence; *at one*—like יחדו; the two ends of the beam in one horizontal line; expressive of great exactness. הַיָּה for הַוָּה, *great misfortune,—extreme wretchedness*—a sighing onomatope, like our word *woe*. See HUPFELD'S very full explanation of the word Ps. v. 10.

[2] Ver. 3. **Incoherent.** Primary sense of לעה is *swallowing*, as our translation gives it. The secondary sense is confused and difficult utterance, as though the words were choked or swallowed.

[3] Ver. 6. **The white of eggs.** This comparison that seems so little poetical, is evidently significant of the unsavoriness and tastelessness of the counsel just given. How vapid is all your moralizing as contrasted with the *pungency* of my insupportable anguish! See the remarks of A. B. Davidson, a late but most admirable commentator, who is very full on this and the following verse.

[4] Ver. 7. דוי לחמי. *Lit.*, **diseases of my food,**—*sickness of my food*, or *food of sickness*—unsavory, or that makes me sick.

[5] Ver. 9. Comp. iv. 21, and Isaiah xxxviii. 12.

[6] Ver. 10. **Endure**; ואסלדה. Most modern commentators follow Schultens in his deduction of this once occurring word from the Arabic צלד, *to paw the ground as a horse*, thence getting the sense of exultation. It seems extravagant, and out of harmony with the other language. Better take it from the Chaldaic סלד, which has the sense of *burning*. Hence also, as senses in use, those of *contracting* drawing ones-self firmly up. See the example given, BUXTORF, Chald. Lex. 1481, from BERESCHITH RABBA, ונפשו סולדת עליו. *anima ejus contrahitur, retrocedit in eo.* Our Eng. Ver. *harden myself* is not far from this idea. **Though He spare not**, or, *let Him not spare*. The 3d clause. Literally: *For I have not denied the words of the Holy One.*

[7] Ver. 13. תושיה, from the substantive verb יש. Anything *substantial* and *real* in distinction from the failing and the *evanescent*.

[8] Ver. 14. Such is Dr. CONANT's clear rendering of this difficult passage. מס; primary sense, *melting*. Hence *failing* (*liquescentem*), *allegoria pereuntis*. See Glass. Philologia Sacra, 1712.

15 Not so *my* friends—illusive as the brook,
As bed of streams whose waters pass away;
16 Whose turbid floods are darkened from the sleet,
As on their face the snowflakes hide[9] themselves.
17 What time they shrink,[10] deserted of their springs,
As quenched in heat they vanish from their place,
18 'Tis then their wonted ways are turned[11] aside;
Their streams are lost, gone up in emptiness.
19 The caravans of Tema look for them.
The companies of Sheba hope in vain.
20 Confounded are they where they once did trust;
They reach the[12] spot and stand in helpless[13] maze.
21 And thus are ye—but nought;
A fearful spectacle ye see, and gaze in terror.
22 Have I said, give to me?
Or from your wealth be liberal for my[14] sake?
23 Or save me from the hostile[15] hand,
Or from the invader's power redeem my life?
24 Give me your counsel, and I'll hold my peace;
And let me clearly know where I am wrong.
25 How mighty are the words of righteousness!
But your reproving! how does *it* convince?
26 At *words* do ye your censures aim?
At wind—such words as one may utter in despair?
27 It is as[16] though you cast lots for the orphan's wealth;
Or traffic[17] made of one you called your friend.
28 And now, O turn to me, behold my face.
I will not speak before you what is false.
29 Return, I pray; let not the wrong prevail.
Return again; there's justice on[18] my side.
30 Is there perverseness in my tongue?
Cannot my conscience[19] still discern iniquity?

[9] Ver. 16. **Hide themselves.** It does not represent a frozen stream, but a dark scene of winter, or of the rainy season, when the wadys are full. It is the snow falling on the swollen waters and immediately disappearing; the same exquisite image that Burns so happily employs:

> Or as the snow falls in the river,
> A moment white, then gone forever.

[10] Ver. 17. **Deserted of their springs.** נצמתו—*cut off from their fountains.* The word זרב occurs but once. It is best derived from the Syriac זרב *coarctavit.* The sense *drying up* is closely allied to this, and also to that of *heating*, which is commonly given to the verb. See DILLMANN and UMBREIT.

[11] Ver. 18. Zöckler here, we think, is right in referring ארחות to the streams themselves, instead of rendering it *caravans* like many others. The process is by way of evaporation; "*they go up into tohu*," the waste atmosphere. It is not easy to apply this language to the caravans, though it is admirably descriptive of the drying up of the streams. The verb ילפתו, *they twist to one side*, well represents an *abandoned channel.*

[12] Ver. 20. **They reach the spot;** עָדֶיהָ. *Right up to it*—on its very brink.

[13] יחפרו, literally, *blush with shame.* The expression is not too strong when we think of the sickening disappointment of men travelling days in the desert, sustained by the hope of the cooling water, and finding at last only the parched bed of the wady.

[14] Ver. 22. **For my sake,** בַּעֲדִי. A wider sense than לי: *For me, pro me—propter me,* as though by way of ransom or deliverance from an enemy. See note 953 to Noldius' Concordance of Hebrew Particles.

[15] Ver. 23. **Hostile hand.** Job seems to be ever thinking of some great and terrible enemy, who is not God. Comp. xvi. 9, 11.

[16] Ver. 27. **As though.** The language is evidently comparative.

[17] Ver. 27. **Or traffic made.** כרה with the sense *emit*, like the corresponding Arabic, and as used Deut. ii. 6; Hos. iii. 2. So SCHLOTTMANN und verhandelt euern Freund.

[18] Ver. 29. The rendering of DELITZSCH.

[19] Ver. 30. **Conscience.** חֵךְ *the palate*, when used metaphorically, denotes the moral rather than the intellectual judgment.

CHAPTER VII.

1 Is not man's life a warfare on the earth?
His day, the hireling's day?
2 As gasps the servant for the shadow's turn,
As longs the toiler for his labor's end,[1]
3 So am I made the heir to months of wretchedness,
And nights of pain they number[2] out to me.
4 When I lie down I say:
How long[3] till I arise, and night be o'er?[4]
Then am I full of tossings till the dawn.
5 My flesh is clothed with worms[5] and clods of earth,
My leprous skin heals up[6] and runs again.
6 My days are swifter than the weaver's dart,
They pass away without a gleam[7] of hope.
7 Remember that my life is breath;
Mine eye shall not again behold the good.
8 The eye that sees me now shall look on me no more;
Thine eye shall seek me, but I shall be gone.[8]
9 As fades the cloud, and vanishes away,
So one goes down to Sheol, never to ascend.
10 No more to his own house he cometh back,
The place that knew him knoweth him no more.

11 ['Tis so with me]. I'll not withhold my words.
In anguish of my spirit let[9] me speak,
And moan[10] in bitterness of soul.
12 Am I a sea, a monster of the deep?
That thou should'st o'er me watch.

1 Ver. 2. **Labors end;** *Merces*, reward, is sometimes the ellipsis to פֹּעַל, *work;* but *end* suits better here.

2 Ver. 3. מִנּוּ לִי. **Number out;** the active used for the passive, say the grammarians; but that explains nothing. There must be a reason for the idiom. Compare Job iv. 19; xviii. 18; xix. 26; xxxiv. 20; Ps. xlix. 15. In these and similar cases, it will be seen that the real or supposed agent is something fearful, or repulsive, as in Job xix. 26. There is a kind of superstition in it; an aversion to the mention of the name, as the Greeks feared to speak the name of the Furies. As remarked in note on vi. 23, Job seems to be *haunted* by the thought of invisible tormentors, as he had good reason to think from what is said in the introductory narrative, and as appears in the terrible language of ch. xvi. 9, 10. This fearful allusion appears, Ps. xlix. 15, כַּצֹּאן לִשְׁאוֹל שַׁתּוּ, "Like sheep *they* put or thrust them (the wicked) into Sheol"—*stabulant in Orco.* The idiom passes into the Greek of the New Testament, Luke xii. 20: *τὴν ψυχήν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ*—"*they* demand thy soul of thee." Who are *they?* Fiends, evil beings, said the old interpreters; "*they* will come after thee." No good reason can be given why it is not the true interpretation. In some cases this reason does not appear so evident. It may be reverence or admiration rather than shuddering fear. As in Isaiah lx. 11, the glorious description of the New Jerusalem: "Thy gates shall stand open day and night"—literally: "*they* shall keep them open." Instead of passive, it is the piel, most intensely active, וּפִתְּחוּ. Who are *they?* The holy angels, or warders of the New Jerusalem. If not this precisely, something very glorious and mighty was in the mind of the prophet, leading him to use the expression. It is quite evident, however, that in Job xvii. 18: "THEY *shall thrust him out from light to darkness*," as also in Job xxxiv. 20, and Ps. xlix. 15, the evil or fearful agents are in the thoughts. See Glassius Phil. Sacra., 817.

3 Ver. 4. **How Long.** *When shall I arise* expresses *eagerness*, which is not wanted here. *How long.* See the passionate places where it occurs in the Psalms.

4 Ver. 4. **Be o'er,** *be gone;* מִדַּד for full form מְנֻדָּד—verbal noun from נדד.

5 Ver. 5. **Worms;** רִמָּה. Many commentators would render it *rottenness;* but there is no need of departing from the usual sense.

6 Ver. 5. **Heals up;** the Arabic sense of רגע suits well here, *to return*, hence to be restored. מסס = מאס. See Ps. lviii. 8. This is the interpretation now given by most commentators.

7 Ver. 6. **Gleam of hope.** אֶפֶס *the least particle, the very extremity;* hence used as a negative to denote total privation—*all gone.*

8 Ver. 8. **I shall be gone.** Compare remarks in the Introductory Argument, p. 5: The pious soul's despondent grief at the thought of bidding farewell to God. Here the converse idea.

9 Ver. 11. **Let me speak;** אדברה. Paragogic future: Language of entreaty.

10 **And moan,** שיח, to make a low murmuring sound—talk to ones-self.

13 I said, my bed shall comfort me;
My couch shall lighten my complaint.[11]
14 'Tis then thou scarest me with dreams,
To fill me with alarm from visions dire.
15 So that my soul even strangling would prefer,—
Death, rather than these bones.[12]
16 I loathe the sight, I would not thus live on.[13]
O let me then alone; my days are vanity.
17 For what is man that thou should'st make him of so great account?
That thou should'st set thy heart upon him?
18 That thou should'st visit him each morning as it comes,
And try him every moment?
19 How long wilt thou not look away from me?
Nor leave me till I draw my laboring[14] breath.
20 Watcher of men, if I have sinned what can I do to thee?
That thou should'st set me for thy mark;
That I should be a burden unto thee?[15]
21 Why not lift up [the burden of] my sin,
And put away all my iniquity?
22 For soon shall I lie down in dust
And thou shalt seek me but I shall not be.

[11] Ver. 13. Taken from Dr. CONANT's Version, which is often rhythmical, although he did not aim at making it such.

[12] Ver. 15. **These bones.** So CONANT, DAVIDSON, and most modern commentators.

[13] Ver. 16. The meaning of this verse has been much discussed. The old rendering "*I would not live always*" seems too sentimental when unqualified. SCHLOTTMANN and others take from it the idea of suicide. *I loathe life; I will not live.* But this is repulsive. The version given exactly suits the condition of the sufferer.

[14] Ver. 19. The rendering usually given is the literal one; and its correctness is put beyond doubt by the Arabic usage (see Hariri, Seance xv., pp. 164, 167. De Sacy's Ed.) It denotes impatience: *Let me have time to swallow.* The version here adopted is merely a substitution of another expression giving the same idea. It is one of the very few cases in which the translator has thus attempted to modernize.

[15] Ver. 20. **Burden unto thee.** We follow DELITZSCH here, who adopts the Jewish traditional reading of עָלַי.

CHAPTER VIII.

1 Then answered Bildad the Shuhite and said:

2 How long wilt thou speak thus?
And like a mighty wind pour forth thy words?
3 The God above—does He in judgment err?
The Almighty One—does He pervert the right?[1]
4 If so it be thy sons have sinned,
And He hath given them up to their own wickedness.
5 If thou thyself should'st early seek to God,
And to the Almighty make thine earnest[2] prayer—
6 If thou thyself wert right and pure,
Then surely would He wake for thee,
And make secure thy home of righteousness.

[1] Ver. 3. **The God above; the Almighty one.** The emphasis here is on the divine names, אל and שדי. Had it been on the idea of perversion (יעוּת) the verb would have been changed, as is usual in the second member of the parallel. The idea most earnestly depreciated is that of Omnipotence perverting justice,—or *might* making *right.*

[2] Ver. 5. **Suppliant prayer.** Intensive form התחנן.

7 However small might be thy first estate,
Thy latter end should prosper gloriously.

8 Ask now the generation gone before.
Yes, of *their* fathers set thyself to learn.
9 [For we are but of yesterday, and nothing know;
So like a shadow are our days on earth].
10 Will they not teach thee, speak to thee,
In parables[3] of deep experience?
11 Grows high[4] the reed except in marshy soil?
Or swells the flag, no water near its root?
12 In its rank greenness, as it stands, uncut,
It drieth up before all other herbs.
13 So are the ways of all who God forget.
So perishes the hope of the impure.
14 His confidence reveals its worthlessness;[5]
His trust,—it is a spider's web.
15 He leans upon his house, but it abideth not;
He grasps it, but it will not stand.[6]
16 Or like the herb so green before the sun,
Whose shoots go forth o'er all its garden bed;
17 Hard by the fountain[7] do its roots entwine;
Among its stones it looketh everywhere.
18 If one uproot him from his place,
It strait disowns him;[8] thee I've never seen.
19 Lo this the joy of his brief way.
('Tis gone), but (like it) from the dust shall others spring.

20 Lo, God the upright never casts away;
Nor takes He by the hand the men of evil deeds.
21 (Wait then) until He fill thy mouth with joy,
Thy lips with jubilee.
22 Thy haters shall be clothed with shame
While tents of evil men are seen no more.

[3] Ver. 10. **In parables.** מלים is more poetical than דברים, and more sententious: *sayings*, *adages*, *apologues*, *parables*, (משלים) *comparisons;* suggesting the tropical language of the *reed*, the *flag*, and the *spider*, that immediately follows. מלבם, *from their heart:* denoting here, as is most common in Hebrew, *understanding*, *experience*, rather than *feeling*. The literal rendering would give to the modern reader a false idea. Hence the paraphrase.

[4] Ver. 11. **Grows high,** יגאה; *proudly*, *gloriously*.

[5] Ver. 14. The well established sense of קוט is *fastidire*, to *loathe*, with בּ when taken transitively. Intransitively, to be *disgusting*, or, when used of a thing, *to disgust;* Ezek. xvi. 47; Ps. xcv. 10; *Niph.* Ezek. xx. 43; xxxvi. 31; *Hiph.* Ps. cxix. 158; cxxxix. 21; see Gesenius. Thus viewed, it would be literally. *his confidence* (כסלו) *disgusis*, like the sense Hieronymus gets, only he renders כסל *vecordia—non placebit ei vecordia sua.* It becomes, or *shows itself worthless to him*. This is the idea given in the version above. The view which regards it as another form of קוץ = קצץ (to cut) seems arbitrary. Besides it would produce an incongruity of metaphor. The figure of cutting, if it had not been used just above, would be consistent with תקוה, *hope;* for the primary idea there is *extension*, *drawing out* (hope as a line or thread); but כסל has no such figure. It denotes *confidence* as derived from the ideas of *strength*, *thickness*, *resistance*, *support*, and hence it is used for *stultitia folly*, *brute confidence*, *stubbornness*. What is meant to be said here is, that this confidence fails; it is seen to be vile and *worthless*. *Non placebit*, as Hieronymus says. It *disgusts* instead of *strengthening*. It cannot be objected that it is applied to the plant, for the person figured is kept in view, and the metaphor is mixed. Such failure of confideuce is exactly expressed by the same word (in Niphal) Ezek. xx. 43; xxxvi. 31: "*And ye shall become disgusted in your own sight*" (ונקטתם בפניכם) *because of your evil*, = כסלכם יקוט.

[6] Ver. 15. **Grasps it.** The figure is kept. The spider breaking through the meshes of his web.

[7] Ver. 17. For the justification of this rendering, see Cant. iv. 12, and notes of Zöckler and Dr. Green on that passage.

[8] Ver. 18. See vii. 10; Ps. ciii. 16. The speaker enters so into his figure that he personifies the plant. Hence the personal *him* is to be preferred to the impersonal *it*.

Chapter IX.

1 Then answered Job and said:

2 Most surely do I know that so it is.
For how shall mortal man be just with God?
3 Be it His will to call him to account,—
For one in thousand of his sins no answer can he make.
4 Most wise in heart, most strong in might!
Who braves him with impunity?

5 'Tis He that moves[1] the mountains and they know it not;
Who overturneth them in His fierce wrath;
6 Who makes the earth to tremble from its place,
Its strong foundations rock.
7 'Tis He who bids the sun, and it withholds its rays;
Who sealeth up the stars;
8 Who bent[2] the heavens all alone,
And walks upon the mountain waves;
9 Who made the Bear, Orion, and the Pleiades,—
The hidden[3] constellations of the South;
10 Who doeth mighty works—unsearchable,—
And wonders infinite.

11 Lo! He goes by me, but I see him not;
Sweeps[4] past, but I perceive him not;
12 See! He assails; then who shall turn him back?
Or who shall say to Him, what doest thou?
13 (Vain check!) Eloah turns not back His wrath
Until the boldest[5] aids go down beneath His hand.

14 How, then, can I reply?
And choose my words in controversy with him?
15 I could not plead it, even were I just;
But to my Judge[6] must supplication make.
16 If I had called, and He had answered me,
I could not trust that He had heard my voice,

[1] Ver. 5. **That moves.** A contrast evidently is intended between מעתיק and the stronger word הפך. The first is the gentler and more gradual change, imperceptible though powerful (*they know it not*). See ch. xiv. 18. Hence its other sense of *growing old*, which it has in Hebrew as well as in Arabic. The other word denotes something sudden and violent.

[2] Ver. 8. **Who bent.** The reference is to the work of creation, though regarded as a work still continuing. It is phenomenal language: the mighty force required to *bend* that strong arch, and *keep it bent*. Er neigt den Himmel ganz allein: Umbreit. In Ps. xviii. 10, the figure is that of bowing, or bending down the heavens to descend.

[3] Ver. 9. **Hidden constellation.** Hebrew, *chambers*. The reference is to the southern celestial spaces, where there are no conspicuous constellations visible to our hemisphere.

[4] Ver. 11. **Sweeps past.** Davidson's rendering of that mysterious word יחלף. See how the infinitive is used, Isa. xxi. 1.

[5] Ver. 13. **Boldest aids.** עֹזְרֵי רהב. Rahab is used here and elsewhere, for any one, or anything, proud or ferocious. See Isa. li. 9; Ps. lxxxvii. 4; lxxxix. 11; Isa. xxx. 7, *etc.* When used as a personification it is thought to mean Egypt. It may mean here Satan, of whom, as several passages show, aside from the Introduction, Job seems to have had some idea as his great enemy—*the Devil and his allies*.

[6] Ver. 15. **My judge.** מְשֹׁפְטִי, an unusual Poel form. So Umbreit, Conant, Delitzsch, *et al.* Gesenius: *Adversary, litigator*, Davidson: *Assailant.*

17 He who[7] o'erwhelms me with a whirlwind storm,
And without cause my wounds so multiplies;
18 Who doth not suffer me to catch[8] my breath,
But fills me with exceeding[9] bitterness.

19 Speak I of strength? A strong one![10] Lo! how strong!
Speak I of right? who sets for me a time?
20 If I claim righteousness, my own words prove me wrong;
Should I say I am pure, He'd show me still perverse.
21 I pure![11] I would not know myself;
I should reject my life.
22 'Tis all the same, and therefore do I say it;
The pure, the wicked, He consumes alike.
23 Comes there the pestilential scourge that slays so suddenly!
He mocks the trial[12] of the innocent.
24 Earth is abandoned to the wicked's hand;
The faces of its judges doth He veil.[13]
If not, who is it then, (the cause and source of all)?

25 My days are swifter than the post;
They flee apace; they see no good;
26 As sweeps the light papyrus bark,
Or as the eagle dashes on its prey.
27 When I resolve, my mourning I'll forget,—
Cast off my look of sorrow, smile[14] again,
28 Then, with a shudder, I recall my woe;
So sure am I Thou wilt not hold me guiltless.
29 Yes, I am wicked; (be it so);
Why labor then in vain?
30 Even should I wash myself in water pure as snow,
And cleanse my hands in lye;
31 Then would'st thou plunge me in the ditch;
So that my very garments should abhor me.

32 For He is not a man like me, that I should answer him.
In judgment, then, together might we come.

[7] Ver. 17. **He who.** אשר here, besides its meaning as a relative, also shows a reason, like the Greek ὅς, and the Latin *qui* = *quia*, or *quoniam*. There may be an anthropopathic reference to the tumult of the storm or whirlwind. *Not hear me*, since he is the very one who overwhelms, *etc.*

[8] Ver. 18. **Catch**—הָשֵׁב, *take back, recover.*

[9] Ver. 18. **Exceeding bitterness.** מררים: intensive plural—*bitternesses, amaritudines*, like אַשְׁרֵי *beatitudines.*

[10] Ver. 19. **A strong one!** The ascribing the latter part of each of these clauses to God, by way of a supposed sudden answer, as is done by DELITZSCH, DAVIDSON, EWALD, and others, is exceedingly arbitrary. The sense is better satisfied by the simpler construction, though a very passionate and broken one. After the closest study of these abrupt and exclamatory verses (19–22), it is difficult to find anything better than what is substantially given in our English Version, somewhat improved by Conant. It is a wild, despairing utterance. There are, indeed, inconsistencies in it, but the attempt to remove them only takes away from the pathos, as well as the passionateness of the whole passage. Job has no false humility. He is utterly in the dark, and almost maddened by his sharp sufferings. God seems to him to be dealing very hardly with him: and he must say it though doing his best to preserve reverence.

[11] Ver. 21. **I pure!** תם אני, in the 21st verse, differs neither in force, nor in construction, from the same expression in the 20th; yet a number of commentators, EWALD, SCHLOTMANN, DAVIDSON, DELITZSCH, *et al.*, make the second a *positive*, instead of a conditional declaration: "I *am* innocent," said emphatically: *I'll say it though I die for it.* This is opposed to the spirit of the whole passage, which, though one of deep complaining, exhibits no defiance.

[12] Ver. 23. מסה, trial πειρασμός. The rendering *wasting away* (as though from מסס) adopted by DELITZSCH, EWALD, and others, is inconsistent with the idea of sudden slaying (פתאם) mentioned in the first clause. Especially is this the case with UMBREIT'S rendering, allmähliger Verzehrung, *gradual consumption.*

[13] Ver. 24. **Doth he veil.** That they may not see the right.

[14] Ver. 27. ואבלינה. A beautiful word. The sudden *lighting* up of the face.

33 But now there is no umpire who can chide,
And lay his tempering hand upon us both.
34 O, would He take His rod away;
So that His terror might not awe my soul;
35 Then fearless would I plead my cause;
For now I'm not[15] myself.

[15] Ver. 35. **I am not myself.** כִּי לֹא כֵן אָנֹכִי עִמָּדִי. A number of the best modern commentators take this as a denial of guilt: "*For I am not conscious to myself of wrong;*" CONANT, literally, *For I am not so in myself.* Now, in many languages, some such expression as this is used to denote derangement—*being not one's self*, or *firm* (כֵּן) *in one's self—the mind wandering;* as poor Lear says of himself:

I fear I am not in my perfect mind.

This seems to be ROSENMUELLER'S view: *haud quidem mei sum compos.* HIERONYMUS: *Neque enim possum metuens respondere.* See Note on דֶּרֶךְ עִמָּדִי xxiii. 10.

CHAPTER X.

1 I am weary of my life,
Unto my inward plaint I yield myself;
O let me speak—my soul in bitterness.[1]
2 Unto Eloah will I say, condemn me not;
O, let me know why thou dost strive with me?
3 Is it thy pleasure that thou should'st oppress?
That thou should'st cast away thy handy work,
And shine upon the counsel of the wicked?
4 Hast thou the eyes of flesh?
Dost thou behold as mortal man beholdeth?
5 Are *thy* days such as his,
Or even like the mighty[2] man, *thy* years?
6 That thou should'st seek for my iniquity,
And hunt up all my sin.
7 'Tis to thy knowledge I appeal; I'm not (this)[3] guilty man
But none can save me from *thy* power.
8 Still thine own hands have wrought me, fashioned me,
In every part—all round. Dost *thou* destroy?
9 Remember, now, that thou hast made me as the clay;
And wilt thou turn[4] me back to dust?
10 Hast thou not poured me out as milk?
And curdled me like[5] cheese?

[1] Ver. 1. **My soul in bitterness.** מַר is an adjective (*amarus*). The phrase מַר נֶפֶשׁ is, strictly, *bitter of soul; bitter in my soul.* The rendering given, if admissible, suits better the broken and passionate context.

[2] Ver. 5. **The mighty man:** A sub-contrast seems intended between אנוש and גבר as in iii. 17. גֶּבֶר, *validus—miles*, Jud. v. 30; Jer. xli. 16; Chald. גְּבַר, *heros, miles*, Ezek. ii. 20. Comp. גִּבּוֹר Isa. ix. , גִּבֹּרִים Gen. vi. 4—*giants—μακρόβιοι.* The want of the distinction makes the rendering very lame, as in E. V.: "Are thy days as the days of *man?* Are thy years as *man's* days?"

[3] Ver. 7. **[This] guilty man.** There is no claim of perfect innocence, but only that he is not the sinner whom his friends hint, or his own inexplicable circumstances would imply.

[4] Ver. 9. **Turn me back to dust.** The argument here goes beyond the first appearance; for Job certainly knew that he must die, even if he had not heard of the declaration, Gen. iii. 19. It is the remediless remaining in this state that he deprecates, whether or not distinctly conscious of it as a dogma, or an idea. In such an abandonment there seems something inconsistent with God's care for men, and the pains he had taken in their construction, whether we call it creation or evolution.

[5] Ver. 10. **Like cheese.** The use of this kind of language in the Koran (see Surat xxii. 5; xcvi. 2, and other places) points back to ancient Arabian conceptions and modes of speech. See also the same process more fully described in the Arabic of the old book of Apologues, entitled *Calila Wa Dimna*, p. 71, *De Sacy Ed.*

11 With skin and flesh, hast thou not clothed me round?
With bones and sinews[6] woven firm my frame?
12 With life and goodness hast thou favored me,
Whilst o'er my breath thy providence hath watched.
13 But these things wast thou hiding in thy heart.
All this, I know, was fixed in thy[7] decree.
14 When e'er I sin, thine eye is noting it;
And thou wilt not absolve me from my guilt.
15 Yes, woe to me if I act wickedly;
If righteous, still may I not lift my head;
So full of shame am I; but see[8] my misery;
16 For it swells[9] high; so like a lion dost thou still pursue,
And still repeat thy wondrous dealing with me.
17 Against me dost thou bring new witnesses.
Thine anger with me dost thou still increase,
As ever changing hosts against me come.

18 Why didst thou bring me from the womb?
I should have died with no eye seeing me;
19 I should have been as though I'd never been,
From womb to grave translated speedily.
20 How few my days! O let Him then forbear
And turn from me, that for a moment I may smile,
21 Before I go whence I shall not return,
To the land of darkness, and the shades of death;
22 A land of gloom tenebrous,[10] dense as night,
Land of the death shade, where no order reigns,
Where day is but a darkness visible.[11]

[6] Ver. 11. **Woven.** Compare Ps. cxxxix. 15, 16.

[7] Ver. 13. עִמָּךְ. **With thee.** In thy most secret purpose.

[8] Ver. 15. **But see** רְאֵה. is imperative. To the objection that in so taking it the construction is broken up, the answer is, that it is all the more expressive. It was meant to be broken. The language is passionate, ejaculatory.

[9] Ver. 16, וְיִגְאֶה. EWALD, DILLMANN, UMBREIT, DAVIDSON, all refer this to ראשׁ, the head, in the preceding verse. MERX says, characteristically, that it is *sinnlos*, has no meaning, and proceeds to change the text. ראשׁ seems too far off, for a subject, and there is nothing conditional in the language: *Should it lift*, or *if it lift up itself. then, etc.*; DAVIDSON. CONANT also adopts this rendering. The E. V. refers it to עָנְיִי *my affliction* just mentioned: *it increaseth*. So Rosenmüller, as also the Jewish Commentators, RASHI and ABEN EZRA. To the objection that גאה is not congruous to עָנְיִ affliction, the latter answers well that it is personified as elate and swelling in its triumph over the sufferer. Hence the rendering above.

[10] Ver. 22. **Gloom tenebrous.** The true impression of this remarkable language (vers. 21 and 22) can only be obtained by a close study of the words עֵפָתָה and תּוֹפַע. They are of a class which, in distinction from חשך, or mere *privative* darkness, represent its *positive* idea, whether real or imaginary, as having something of form, and thus a kind of visibility,—a dark, shadowy, waving, flying, floating thing,—a faintly *glimmering*, *gleaming*, *gloaming*, *wavy* motion, shading off from light (gleam, glimmer) into *gloom*, or darkness visible. A vibratory, pulsatory, flying, fluttering, or undulation of some kind, is the radical image in this whole family of words (יָעוּף, עָפַף, עַפְעַף, by metathesis יָפַע), and hence, along with *flying*, the apparently contradictory images of *light* and darkness. See LANGE Gen. Am. Ed., p. 179, Note. So in the Greek imagery, darkness has wings. Night is called (ARISTOPH. Aves. 689) μελανόπτερος, *black winged*. (Compare VIRG. Æn. II. 360, VI. 856). There is the same radical image in the expression עַפְעַפֵּי שָׁחַר III. 9, XLI. 10. palpebræ auroræ, *eyelids of the dawn*,—the morning twilight, ἁμέρας βλεφαρον SOPH. *Antiq.* 104. Compare the words מָעוּף and מוּעָף, Isa. viii. 22, 23.

[11] Ver. 22. **Darkness visible.** Some commentators take this in a sort of conditional way: *Its very light* (*if it had any*) *shines as darkness*, or its day (daytime) is as midnight darkness—"the blackness of darkness." So we have given it, though the verb וַתֹּפַע seems to have something more positive than this,—*it shines as darkness.* We cannot help thinking that Job had something of the Miltonic conception. HIERONYMUS, *Sempiternus horror inhabitant.*

Chapter XI.

1 Then answered Zophar the Naamathite and said,

2 A flood of words; demands it no reply?
A man all lips! shall he be justified?
3 Thy clamors, shall they silence men?
That thou may'st thus rave on without rebuke;
4 And say, my doctrine, it is pure,
I'm guiltless in Thy sight.
5 O were it so that God would really[1] speak;
And for thy silencing[2] His lips unclose;
6 And show thee wisdom's hidden depths,—
Truth's twofold[3] form.
For know it well; less than thy debt doth God exact[4] of thee.

7 Eloah's secret,[5] canst thou find it out?
Or Shaddai's[6] perfect way canst thou explore?
8 Higher than Heaven's height, what canst thou do?
Deeper than Sheol's depths, what canst thou know?
9 Its measurement is longer than the earth,
And broader than the sea.
10 When He is passing by, and makes arrest,
And calls to judgment, who can answer him?
11 For well He knows the men of vanity;
Their evil sees, though seeming not to heed.[7]
12 Since man, vain man, has madness in his heart;[8]
A foal of the wild ass, so is he born.

[1] Ver. 5. Or, *were it really so:* The force of אולם: Would God take Job at his word and appear in very truth?

[2] Ver. 5. עִמָּךְ, in controversy with thee, as elsewhere used. *For thy confounding;* to stop thy mouth.

[3] Ver. 6. Delitzsch, literally, "*that she* (wisdom) *is twofold*"—overlooking תושיה. Davidson paraphrases: *Double*, he says, is equivalent to *manifold*, and תושיה he renders *insight*, as Ewald does. Most commentators give the literal sense, *double*. Do we not get a good explanation of this from ch. xxviii., where *two forms* of wisdom are set forth, namely, the Divine wisdom, or the mystery of God's providence, and the wisdom mentioned at the end of that chapter, the wisdom which is for man, "*the fear of the Lord*," submission, and "*departure from evil.*" תושיה is *substance, reality, truth—things as they are*, יֵשׁ. οὐσία; but it is to be contemplated under *two* aspects, as pertaining to God, and as pertaining to man. See Sirach xxxiii. 15: xiii. 24: πάντα δισσά, ἓν κατέναντι ἑνός, κ. τ. λ.

[4] Ver. 6. Ewald renders: "*Overlooks much of thy guilt*," which is not far from E. V. Umbreit, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Davidson, with the *Targum*, give it the sense of נשה (Hiph. השה), to *forget*, or *cause to forget*, giving מ in מעונך the force of a partitive: *from* or *of*,—*a portion of thy sin*. "*God remembers not all thy sin.* The Syriac renders it, *forgiveth*. *Vulgate* has the other sense of נשה, that of *exacting* like a creditor. And this is the rendering of E. V., which, after all, seems the best, and most in harmony with the context. It is grammatical, too, since מ in מעונך, may denote the comparison of *less*, as well as that of *more*, to be determined by the context. The partitive rendering: "*a portion of thy sin*," seems tame. The rendering above given preserves well the association of ideas. This is one of those secrets of God's wisdom,—the upper wisdom, or the side of the *duplicate* seen by Him. For God only knows what human sin deserves, and every chastisement, short of the great retribution, has mercy mingled with it. And then this admirably leads to the train of thought that follows in the exclamations below, ver. 7. עון is rendered debt to preserve the figure, which is sanctioned in the New Testament: "*Forgive us our debts; our sins.*"

[5] Ver. 7. חקר. *Mystery—unsearchableness,*

[6] The emphasis is on the divine names אלוה and שדי, as in viii. 3.

[7] Ver. 11. ולא יתבונן. The meaning is that it does not require from him a special act of study or attention, as it does from men. He never loses sight of it. He sees it though he does not seem to be looking at it. The conjugation Hith. has this sense of making to be, or assuming to be what the verb signifies,—*to make one's-self observant*. Raschi explains it well of God's "keeping still, and long-suffering, as though he did not take note of it"—כמו שלא יתבונן.

[8] Ver. 12. יִלָּבֵב. The word does not denote wisdom, as many commentators take it, or the want of wisdom, *directly*, or in the sense of *stupidity*, as Gesenius interprets it, but to be full of *heart*, in the sense of *courage* (*cor*, Latin *cordatus* sometimes), *spirit*, *eagerness*, *mettlesomeness*, *ferocity*, *etc.* In Cant. iv. 9 the piel, לִבַּבְתִּנִי (of which this may be regarded as the passive), means, thou hast *excited*, *roused*, *warmed* my heart. There can be but little doubt as to the meaning, since the second clause gives a figurative explanation of it. It suggests Ecclesiastes ix. 3, הוללות בלבבם, "*madness in their hearts*"—whence the above translation. Some accommodation to it in English might be found in the words *heady*,

13 (But as for thee), If thou prepare thy heart,
And spread thy hands (in humble prayer) before him,—
14 Putting[9] it far away, if sin be in thy hand,
Nor letting wrong abide within thy tents,—
15 Then shalt thou lift thy face without a stain;
Then shalt thou stand secure,[10] with nought to dread.
16 For thy sharp pain shalt thou forget,
And like the passing waters, think of it no more.
17 Brighter than noon shall life[11] again arise;
And what is darkness[12] now shall be like morn.
18 Then shalt thou be assured that there is hope;
Though now ashamed,[13] in peace shalt thou lie down,
19 And take thy rest with none to make afraid;
Whilst many [who have scorned] shall seek thy face.
20 But as for wicked men, their eyes shall fail;
Their refuge perishes;
Their hope—'tis like the parting breath.

headstrong; לב, *heart*, in Hebrew, being used for *feeling* or *passion*, as well as for intellect. UMBREIT, EWALD and DELITZSCH take it as a proverb, and give it the forced rendering (in the words of the latter)

> Before an empty head gaineth understanding,
> An ass's foal would be born a man.

This is not only frigid, in itself, and forced, and at war with the gravity of the original, but cannot be brought grammatically out of the words. *Man, vain man.* The repetition is to give emphasis to that expressive word נָבוּב.

[9] Ver. 14. This verse evidently comes in parenthetically, and therefore the participial form gives the best mode of rendering.

[10] Ver. 15. מֻצָק. Primary sense *fusion*, thence *molten*, thence the idea of a metallic column figurative of firmness and solidity. It may be that the meaning here is derived from the cognate יצג (מַצָּג) *stabilire.*

[11] Ver. 17. חֶלֶד. Αἰών—*time-passing*—a very pathetic word. Comp. Ps. xxxix. 6; xvii. 14; lxxxix. 48.

[12] Ver. 17. **Darkness.** תָּעֻפָה—a word of the same class with those mentioned in note on x. 22.

[13] Ver. 18. **Ashamed.** This is the rendering of Gesenius, giving to חפר the same sense it has in vi. 20. The other sense of the verb, *to dig*, and that derived from it, to *search*, are very forced here. See E. V., DAVIDSON, DELITZSCH, and others. UMBREIT gets from SCHULTENS, and the Arabic, the sense of *protecting*, which better suits the context, but is philologically without weight. The *Vulgate* gives the sense of *digging.* The LXX, as is most commonly the case in Job, is worthless. Merx renders very beautifully, though freely—

> Und, ob beschämt zuvor, noch sicher ruhn.

CHAPTER XII.

1 Then answered Job and said:

2 Ye are the people, there's no doubt;
And wisdom dies with you.
3 But I have understanding like yourselves;
In nothing do I fall below your mark.
Who knoweth not such things as these?
4 Sport to his friend! yes, such am I become,
Though one who calls on[1] God, and whom he hears;
A sport, (your) sport! A man upright and true!

[1] Ver. 4. **Who calls on God.** *I who call on God.* Job means himself here, not only as a man of prayer, קֹרֵא לֶאֱלוֹהַּ, but as one known among men for the public or official performance of religious worship. So CARYL intimates, referring to Ps. xcix. 6, "Moses and Aaron among his priests, Samuel among those who call upon his name," בְּקֹרְאֵי שְׁמוֹ. His offering sacrifice, i. 5, shows something of the priestly character. The verse is a vehement torrent of righteous indignation, and the best translation is that which keeps nearest to the Hebrew with all its abruptness. It was probably called out by Zophar's comparing him to "the wild ass," xi. 12.

5 As wasted lamp[2] to splendors of the proud,
So is the man who stands on tottering feet;
6 Whilst quiet are the spoilers' tents,—
All confident[3] the men who anger God,
Into whose hands[4] Eloah sends (his bounty).

7 But surely ask the beasts and they will teach;
The birds of heaven will make it known to thee;
8 Or converse[5] hold with earth, and it will speak;
The fishes of the sea will tell it thee:
9 Who knoweth not, by every one of these,
Jehovah's hand it is that doeth this?
10 In whose hand lieth every breathing life;
The spirit of all flesh—of every man.
11 Doth not the ear try words,
As tastes the palate food?
12 So with the old is sage experience;[6]
With length of days doth understanding dwell.

13 With God, too, there is wisdom, strength is His,
Counsel to plan and never-erring[7] skill.

[2] Ver. 5. **A wasted lamp:** לַפִּיד בּוּז. Literally *a lamp of contempt*, but the figure demands the idea of that for which it is despised—*worn out, exhausted*, either in its structure or its oil, and, therefore, thrown away as useless. The passage has been regarded as very difficult. *Obscuritatem summam hujus versus omnes interpretes agnoscunt*, says Schultens. "The words of this text are dark," says the learned Puritan CARYL in his quaint style, "and there are not a few who make the lamp the darkest word in it." And then he goes on to note the other rendering given by Aben Ezra, and which has since been adopted by the principal modern interpreters, except UMBREIT. It divides the word לַפִּיד into the noun פִּיד *destruction, calamity* or *misfortune* generally, and the servile לְ, the preposition, with the sense of *for* or *in place of*: "*for misfortune, contempt.*" The translator was at first inclined to this view. It is, however, full of difficulties, though in some of its aspects seeming quite plausible. The rendering which EWALD, DELITZSCH and others give to the words immediately following seems to suit it, especially as expressed in the concise and happy way of MERX:

Dem Unglück Hohn, so wähnen Sichere:—
For suffering scorn; so fancy the secure;
Scorn ever ready for the tottering man.

So the translator first rendered it, relying for the sense of נָכוֹן on Ps. xxxviii. 18, אֲנִי לְצֶלַע נָכוֹן, *ready to halt.* A more thorough study, however, produced the conviction that the older rendering of the VULGATE, the SYRIAC, the TARGUM, the Jewish commentators KIMCHI, RASCHI, BEN GERSON and others, JUNIUS and TREMELLIUS, LUTHER, E. V., MERCERUS, VATABLUS, COCCEIUS, and of the best of the authorities cited in POOLE'S Synopsis, is the correct one. ZÖCKLER says: "The sense of *lamp* makes an incongruous image in the picture." That depends, however, on what the picture is supposed to be. "A consumed or expiring lamp," says CONANT, "would be pertinent; but *a torch despised* is like anything else that is despised, and the epithet requires some ground for the application." All this question of metaphorical congruity, however, depends upon another, namely, whether the right rendering is given to עַשְׁתוּת. The primary sense of the verb עָשַׁת is certainly to *shine*. See Jerem. v. 28. Hence the noun, if rendered *thoughts*, must be regarded as figuratively denoting *splendid, brilliant thoughts, imaginings, vain imaginations*,—not simply *cogitations*. So עֶשְׁתֹּנוֹת, Ps. cxlvi. 4: *In that day his proud imaginations* (*his splendid hopes*) *all perish.* This is quite different from *his thoughts, his thinking*, as the annihilationist perverts that text. In Jonah i. 6 the Hithpahel may very pertinently be rendered *shine upon*, instead of, "*think upon.*" It thus makes a very appropriate prayer for men in such a dark tempest: *that the* sky would clear up, or that God would shine upon them through it. So in Cant. v. 24, עֶשֶׁת means something *shining, polished.* So COCCEIUS and some of the older commentators, Christian and Jewish. If we give to עשתות here this primary sense of *shining, splendor* (whether of the thoughts or of the outward state), then the antithesis it presents to לַפִּיד, the cast off, used up torch, is no longer "incongruous," but very happy: the poor wasted thing, which Job so much resembled, as contrasted with the splendors of wealth, or the *high imaginings* of a soul at ease. It is the very image used Isai. xlii. 3, *the sputtering wick* or *lamp*, פִּשְׁתָּה כֵהָה (the "*smoking flax*"), and cited by our Saviour, Matt. xii. 20.

[3] Ver. 6. **All confident.** Plural noun with superlative sense.

[4] Ver. 6. **Into whose hands,** *etc.* This is rendered by some: "*who take God in their hand;*" regarding לְ as repeated here from the line above. So DAVIDSON and DELITZSCH. The sense they get is, that wicked men make their hand (their own power) their God. For this there is cited Habak. i. 11, and VIRG. *Aen.* x. 774: 27. *Dextra mihi Deus.* DELITZSCH renders it very strangely: "who take Eloah in their hand." The use of Eloah, however, seems strongly against this. The ellipsis in the other rendering is quite facile.

[5] Ver. 8. **Delitzsch** excellently renders שִׂיחַ "*look thoughtfully to the ground.*" The reference in this whole appeal (vers. 7 and 8) is not, as Ewald thinks, to the destined purpose or divine *reason* in suffering and in pain. That belongs to the wisdom which "the eagle's eye hath not seen, and which is hid from all the fowls of the air;" xxviii. 7, 21,—the deep wisdom of God. The allusion is rather to Zophar's expression of the fact, so pretentiously set forth, as it seemed to Job, when all nature, animate and inanimate, proclaims the existence of inexplicable mystery in the divine dealings. It is not the *reason* that we get from nature. but the *fact*, whether we understand it or not, that the hand of the Lord doeth all.

[6] Ver. 12. חכמה must be rendered *experience* to preserve the figures in the verse above.

[7] Ver. 13. תבונה here *is discernment* or wisdom in *adapting* means to ends. The epithet is necessary because there is an evident intention to set in contrast the divine discernment, or *perfect* foresight, and the best human experience, as mentioned above ver. 12. DELITZSCH defines תבונה as "that which can penetrate to the bottom of what is true or false." There is here again a *duality* in wisdom as in xi. 6

14 Lo! He casts down; it never shall be built;
He shutteth up; there is no opening.
15 The waters He withholds; the streams are dry;
He sends them forth, and they lay waste the earth.
16 With Him is power, eternal truth[8] is His;
To Him alike are known deceiver and deceived.
17 'Tis He that leadeth counsellors despoiled,[9]
And makes the judges fools.
18 'Tis He who breaks the bonds of kings,
And binds their loins with cords.
19 Priests too He leadeth, stripped[10] (of sacred robes).
The long established[11] (thrones) He overthrows.
20 The trusted He deprives of speech,
And takes away the judgment of the old.
21 On nobles doth He pour contempt,
And renders weak the girdle of the strong.
22 Deep things from darkness He reveals;
Tzalmaveth[12], world of shadows, brings He forth to light.
23 He makes the nations grow, and then destroys;
Extends their bounds, then lets them pass away.
24 Chiefs of the earth, of reason he deprives,
And makes them wander in a pathless waste.
25 They grope in darkness, where no light appears;
He makes them stagger like a drunken man.

(כִּפְלַיִם), though not exactly the same with that referred to by the would-be philosopher Zophar above, or by Job himself, xxviii. 23–25. It is two-fold: the wisdom of God in the processes of designing or adapting (תבונה, *skill, discernment*), and the higher wisdom (חכמה as עצה), which is in the design of the designs.

8 Ver. 16. **Power—eternal truth.** There is no desire to find too scientific or too philosophical a meaning in Job; but these are the best renderings we can give to those contrasted words עז and תושיה. The latter is the *reality of things*, that which makes them to *be* what they *are*, their ideas, laws or principles as distinguished here from *power* or *force*, to use the word now such a great one in science—or dynamical energy. See Daniel xi. 38, מָעֻזִּים אֱלֹהַּ, *the god of forces.* DELITZSCH renders תּוּשִׁיָּה *existence*, and defines it as the *real* in contrast with what *appears*. Better to have rendered it *being*—that which truly is—all that *is*, as God's *truth*. See Note to xxvi. 3.

9 Ver. 17. שׁוֹלָל, used collectively. Either literal, or as the phrase is used in Latin, *captos mente*, *despoiled* of reason. See Ps. lxxvi.: אשתוללו אבירי לב.

10 Ver. 19. So DELITZSCH supplies the ellipsis.

11 So CONANT.

12 Ver. 22. This word *Tzalmaveth*, together with *Sheol* and *Hades*, should have been naturalized in our English version.

CHAPTER XIII.

1 Behold all this mine eye hath seen;
Mine ear hath heard and understood it well.
2 What ye know I do also know;
In nothing do I fall below you.
3 For truly 'tis to Shaddai I would speak.
With God to plead—this is my strong desire.
4 But ye indeed![1] forgers of lies are ye;
Physicians of no value are ye all.
5 O that you would be altogether still.
For that would surely be your wisest way.

1 Ver. 4. **But ye indeed.** Force of אולם.

6 But hear *my* pleading now;
O listen to the strivings of *my* lips.
7 For God,[2] will ye speak what is wrong?
And utter specious things[3] in His behalf?
8 Dare ye His person to accept[4]?
Is it for God,[5] indeed, that ye contend?
9 Say, is it well, that He should search you out?
Or as man mocketh man, so mock ye Him?
10 Sure, He will make your condemnation clear;[6]
If thus, in secret, partially ye deal.
11 Shall not His glory fill you with alarm?
His dread[7] upon you fall?
12 Pictures[8] in ashes drawn, your maxims grave;
Your strong defences are but mounds of clay.

13 Be still; let me alone;[9] that I may speak,—
Whatever may befall.[10]
14 My flesh,[11] why should I bear it in my teeth?
My very life, why take it in my hand.
15 Lo! Let Him slay me; still for Him I'll wait;[12]
And still defend my ways before His face.
16 Yes, my salvation shall He be;
For in His presence the impure shall never come.

17 Hear now, O hear my word;
My declaration, hold it in your ears.
18 Behold me now; I have prepared my cause;
I'm sure I can maintain my right.
19 Who then is HE,[13] that shall against me plead?
For now if I keep silence I must die.
20 Only two things do not thou unto me;
And then from thine appearing I'll not hide.

[2] Ver. 7. **For God.** The Hebrew order is carefully observed since the surprise is that such a thing should be done for God.

[3] Ver. 7. **Specious things.** רמיה can hardly be taken here in the sense of intended *deceit*.

[4] Ver. 8. The English phrase, though now becoming obsolete, is still understood from its Bible use, and is very expressive.

[5] Ver. 8. Here, too, the Hebrew order is preserved. The contrast denotes surprise.

[6] Ver. 10. The intensive double form, הוֹכֵחַ יוֹכִיחַ, denotes strong and open *conviction*. Thus it furnishes the antithesis to בַּסֵּתֶר (in secret) in the second clause. Something of the kind seems intended. It suggests, too, the idea of something almost prophetical of the *conviction* of Job's friends, and their *open* condemnation, xlii. 7.

[7] Ver. 11. **His dread.** פחד stronger than יראה.

[8] Ver. 12. משלי אפר. The rendering *pictures* here, may be an accommodation, but it is in harmony with the etymological and general meaning of the root. SCHLOTTMANN: Eure Denksprüche sind Aschensprüche.

[9] Ver. 13. Our E. V. is very happy here. *Be still from me*, which is the literal rendering, is opposed to our idiom.

[10] Ver. 13. Literally: *come upon me what may*.

[11] Ver. 14. A climax: *flesh* and *life*. The literal rendering of the verse is clear. For the different views of its application see DELITZSCH.

[12] Ver. 15. **I'll wait.** In regard to this disputed verse, everything depends on the reading, whether לֹא, or לוֹ as it is in the Keri. The Masoretic authority is in favor of the latter. So are the ancient Versions, Syriac and Vulgate. See the evidence most fully and fairly summed up by DELITZSCH, who adopts the rendering that has prevailed in the Church. In regard to the internal evidence, as he well says, nothing could be more Job-like. See xiv. 14, 15; xix. 25. Job's lowest despondency is generally the season when his strangely supported spirit mounts up to the strongest expression of his never to be extinguished hope.

[13] Ver. 19. **Who then is HE?** The one challenged here would seem to be God, although commentators generally do not thus regard it. If so, מי would properly be exclamatory, rather than interrogatory: *What kind of a one?* The view has some confirmation in what follows, (ver. 20), unless we suppose an abrupt change of person, a thing which indeed often occurs in Hebrew, but would not be necessary here. It explains, too, the language of the second clause. Some render this, "*then shall I be silent and expire.*" But such a construction as אחריש ואגוע suggests something conditional, as it is well rendered in E. V.: "*If I hold my peace, I shall give up the ghost.*" It looks as though Job shrunk from the challenge, but felt that he must utter it or die. The VULG. seems to have had this view in its *interpolation, veniat! Let him come—let him appear: Veniat; quare tacens consumor?* If the view be correct, then, there would be an emphasis on הוא, expressed, it may be, in the tone, or δεικτικῶς, as the critics say, and which is here attempted to be represented by capitals.

21 Far off withdraw thy hand from me,
Nor let thy terror fill me with alarm.
22 Then call thou; I will make response;
Or I will speak, and do thou answer me.
23 How many are my sins—my trespasses—
My errors—my transgressions? Let me know.
24 Why hidest thou thy face from me?[14]
Why hold me for thy foe?
25 A driven leaf would'st thou affright?
The withered chaff pursue?
26 For bitter things against me thou dost write;[15]
And to my youthful sins, thou makest me the[16] heir.
27 My feet thou puttest in the stocks,
And guardest all my ways,
Making thy mark[17] upon my very soles;
28 Whilst he[18] (thus watched) in rottenness consumes;
Or like a garment which the moth devours.

[14] Ver. 24. DELITZSCH well says: "The bold confidence expressed in the question and challenge of ver. 23 (and he might have said of ver. 19) is here changed to a sort of mournful astonishment at God's not appearing, and his seeming to hold him as an enemy without an investigation of his case."

[15] Ver. 26. **Thou dost write.** DELITZSCH renders *thou decreest.* The literal sense is better as preserving the favorite Scriptural image of God's recording book.

[16] Ver. 26. Literally, *make me inherit.* Others render it, *possess;* but that loses the most impressive figure: the old man heir to the young man's follies.

[17] Ver. 27. **Making thy mark.** Here, as elsewhere sometimes, the most literal rendering gives the best clue to the meaning. The translator must express his surprise at the way in which commentators have gone round and round the idea without exactly hitting it. Most of them take it as meaning "*to set a bound about the feet,*" to prevent his going beyond it. So HEILIGSTEDT, HIRZEL, DILLMANN, SCHLOTTMANN, CONANT, who cites them, and others. GESENIUS: *circa radices pedum meorum effodisti fossam,* "*dug a trench around them.*" EWALD, citing Aben Ezra, held this view at first, but afterward changed it for another. He renders תתחקה *dich versicherst, makest thyself sure of,* which is true as an inferential conclusion, but can, in no way, be taken as a sense of תתחקה. To get it, he goes a great way, and most unnecessarily, to the Arabic *chakka,* v. *conjugation, tachakkaka ala, certus factus*—a secondary Arabic sense, derived from an older secondary Hebrew sense of the Poel, *decrevit, legislavit;* and then he compares it with *tachakkama ala.* Besides, *tachakkaka* is not followed by *ala,* but by *min.* Everything in the context goes to show that חקה here, = חקק, has its *primary* sense of *marking.* Tremellius renders it quite literally: *super radices pedem meorum imprimeris,* and is followed by our English Version: "*thou settest a print upon the heels of my feet.*" This gives the exact idea, except in its failure to represent the reflex, or Hithpahel, sense of תתחקה, which DELITZSCH finds a difficulty, although he renders it, like so many others, "*thou makest for thyself a circle around the soles of my feet.*" It is not easy to see how he and others get from the words the sense *surrounding,* or to *set round.* The Hithpahel, like the Greek Middle, may be often rendered by the addition of the personal possessive pronoun. Thus, *Kal, Thou markest; Hithpahel,* thou makest *thy* mark—thy *mark for thyself.* This at once suggests the idea which our E. V. and Tremellius come very near expressing. It is, in general, the owner putting his mark somewhere upon his beast, that he may know it, and, in this case, more specially, putting a mark upon the foot—as on the camel's hoof, for example, that he may track it when wandering in the desert. The VULGATE: *vestigia pedum meorum considerasit,* seems suggested by this, and may itself have suggested Ewald's interpretation. The grievance Job complains of, in this case, would be like putting such a mark upon an old worn-out camel, which, instead of straying, was unable to stand up. Thus Job represents the dealing with himself, so watched, so marked, and yet so helpless. It is in perfect harmony with the complaint above, "*Thou guardest all my ways,*" and with what is said about "*the driven* leaf," and "*chasing the withered*" chaff: it is all so useless, and therefore cruel. In this interpretation, there may, perhaps, be found a clue to the sudden change of person in the next verse.

[18] Ver. 28. **Whilst he.** Job still has in mind the animal to whom his figure refers, but, at the same time, intending himself, as one thus watched, and having a mark put upon his feet to track him if he strays, although he is a poor emaciated creature, without strength to move or stand. To a Hebrew reader accustomed to it, this change (though the transition from the 1st person to the 3d is rare) would be felt as very touching. We can only supply it by an ellipsis as the translator has endeavored to do.

CHAPTER XIV.

1 ———[1] Man of woman born;
Few are his days, and full of restlessness.
2 He comes forth like a flow'r, and is mown down;
Flees[2] like a passing shadow—makes no stay.

[1] Ver. 1. This may be supposed to be said after a brief pause.

[2] Ver. 2. **Flees.** Heb. *and flees.* The frequent Hebrew conjunction ו is often a mere breathing, a transition particle, merely indicating a going on of the thought. In such cases, we come nearer to the spirit of the original by leaving the passage *unbound* (ἀσύνδετον), than by clogging it with our heavy connective *and.* See the rendering of xlii. 23 as compared with the original.

3 On such a being,[3] openest thou thine eye,
To bring me into judgment with thyself?
4 O could[4] there come one pure from the impure!
But there is no such one.
5 If now his days are all decreed,
And fixed the number of his months by thee;
If thou hast set a bound he cannot pass;
6 Then turn away from him and let him rest,
Till like a hireling he enjoy his day.

7 For a tree there still is hope.
Cut down, it springs again;
Nor do its suckers fail.
8 Though in the earth its root be old,
Its stump all dead and [5](buried) in the dust;
9 From waters inhalation will it bud,
And send forth shoots like a new planted stem.
10 But man—he dies and fallen[6] wastes away;
Man draws his parting breath, and where is he?
11 As fail the waters from the sea;[7]
As wastes the flood and drieth up,—
12 So man lies down to rise no more;
Until the Heavens be gone, they ne'er awake,
Nor start them from their sleep.

[A BRIEF PAUSE.]

13 O that in Sheol thou would'st lay me up;
That thou would'st hide me till thy wrath shall turn,[8]—
Set me a time, and then remember me.

[A MUSING SILENCE.]

14 Ah, is it so?[9] When man dies, does he live again!

[3] Ver. 3. עַל זֶה: **on this**; δεικτικῶς; either by tone or gesture indicating that he means himself; as is shown by the sudden change of person. MERX wholly destroys the pathos of this by arbitrarily changing אֹתִי into אֹתוֹ.

[4] Ver. 4. **O could.** The optative rendering here is not only according to the usual use of מִי יִתֵּן, but gives more distinctly the idea of inherited human depravity, and consequent disease, which here forces itself upon the mind of Job. On this account, it may be thought singular that it should be generally adopted by the more rationalizing commentators. There is here, says UMBREIT, the Oriental (!) idea of the Erbsünde: but then he immediately qualifies it as usual by saying: "Not, however, in the sense of the subtile dogmatic definitions."

[5] Ver. 8. The supply of the ellipsis only gives the full meaning.

[6] Ver. 10. חלש unites both these senses: *fallen—wastes.* It puts him in contrast with the *fallen tree.*

[7] Ver. 11. ים may mean any large collection of water.

[8] Ver. 13. שוב denotes a *turning.* DELITZSCH, very happily: "*Till thine anger change.*"

[9] Ver. 14. **"Ah, shall he live?"** הֲיִחְיֶה. This language is neither that of denial, nor of dogmatic affirmation. Between these lie two states of soul: one of sinking doubt, the other of rising hope. It depends upon the tone and manner of utterance, whilst these, again, can only be recalled to us by something in the structure of the sentence, or by the context. The particle ה is the hinge on which the sentence opens. It may be taken two ways. Its force may be regarded as confined to its own clause locally, or, with more reason, may it be supposed to rule the whole sentence; since אם is merely transitive, and here implies no doubt. It is exclamatory, as well as interrogative. *If a man die, or when a man dies, ah, shall he live again!* That, *in English*, might possibly be the language of doubt, though much would depend upon contextual considerations. Or, take the other style of utterance (in English, we mean): *Ah, is it so, when man dies, does he live again?* This would correspond to the idea of the interrogative ה influencing the whole verse; אם being entirely subordinate. It is not despairing, nor even desponding, but an expression of wonder, rather, at the greatness of an idea striking the mind in some fresh and startling aspect. It is surprise, rather than doubt, or the state of soul which Homer so naturally, as well as vividly, represents, Iliad xxiii. 103. Achilles, like all the other Greeks, believed in the reality of a spirit world, as distinctly held in his day; yet when the dream, or the appearance of Patroclus, startles him with an unusually near and vivid thought of it, he cries out:

Ὢ πόποι ἦ ῥά τίς ἐστι καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισιν
Ψυχὴ καὶ εἴδωλον;

O wonder! Is there truly in that unseen world
Both soul and form?

And so even the Christian believer might speak when the momentous thought comes suddenly before him with some

Then all the days appointed me I'll wait,
Till my reviving[10] come.
15 Then thou wilt call, and I will answer thee;
For thou wilt yearn[11] towards thy handy work.
16 But now thou numberest my steps;
Thou wilt not set a guard[12] upon my sin;
17 (For) sealed, as in a bag, is my transgression bound,
And mine iniquity thou sewest[13] up.

[A LONGER INTERVAL OF SILENCE.]

18 Yes[14]—even the mountain falling wastes away;
The rock slow changes from its ancient[15] place;
19 The water wears the[16] stones;
Its overflowings sweep away the soil;
So makest thou to perish human hope.

new impressiveness. There is still another shade of the idea, near akin to this feeling of wonder: When a man *dies*, does he *live?* That is: Is death really the way to life? Do we live by dying? See the quotation from Euripides, and the remarks in the INTRODUCTION ON THE THEISM, page 8. In regard to the force of the context, there can be but little doubt. There is certainly a rising of hope which has somehow come in after the mournful language of ver. 12. This prompts the prayer preceding, in ver. 13; then there is the exclamation; and then, as though from some inspiration it had given him, the strong declaration that he would wait for this change, as involving something most desirable, though wholly unknown. Immediately follow words that seem to rise to full assurance (ver. 15): "Thou *wilt* call, and I will answer thee; thou *wilt* have regard to the work of thy hands." This force of the context is very clearly presented by DELITZSCH. The mode of expression implies something of a traditional knowledge, to say the least: *Ah, is it so*, as we have heard, τὸ θρυλλούμενον—that saying rumored everywhere? For surely Job must have heard it, or heard of it. The Egyptians had it; see DIOD. SIC. i. 51. According to the Rationalists themselves, the Persians and other trans-Euphratean nations must have had it long before the time they ascribe to the book of Job. If the Vedas which MERX quotes (see INT. THEISM, page 16) are as old as pretended, some rumor of this idea must have crossed the Indus, and reached the land of Uz. The Greeks, we know, had it in the ante-Homeric times. There is good evidence, too, of its having been entertained by the early Arabian tribes; as is shown by passages in the Koran where the Infidels reply to Mohammed, saying: "When we are dead and have become dust and dry bones, how can we be revived? Why, this is just what we were threatened with, we and our fathers of old; away with it; surely this is nothing more than fables of the ancient men." See Koran *Surat*. xxiii. 84, 85; xxvii. 69, 70. and other places.

[10] Ver. 14. **Reviving.** חליפה: General sense *change*, *vicissitude*, from that mysterious root חלף. It is used in connection with צבא, *warfare, time of military or other service*, x. 17. Here the *change*, naturally suggested by the context, is release from Sheol, as from a warfare, when that set time comes. There can hardly be a doubt, however, that the use of the word here is suggested to Job by the verb יחליף, which he had taken, ver. 7, to denote the regermination of the tree. This, of itself, would seem to settle it that the change in view is one of reviviscence, and the idea derives still farther aid from the use of the word. Ps. xc. 5, where the Kal is applied to the flower growing up in the morning, and Ps. cii. 27, where the Hiphil denotes the reviviscence of nature in the new Heavens and the new Earth. As change, it is never change from life to death; and if that were the meaning intended here, a more unfit word could not be found.

[11] Ver. 15. **Wilt yearn.** תכסף: a word of great strength and pathos, well rendered *yearn* by CONANT. In Ps. lxxxiv. 3, the Niphal is used to express the longing of the soul for God and the services of his house. There it is joined with כלה: "*pines*, yea *faints* my soul for the courts of the Lord." In Gen. xxxi. 30, it is used to describe Jacob's intense longing for home. And this is the word which, by a blessed anthropopathism, is used here to express God's longing for the handy work which he had once so curiously and marvellously made.

[12] Ver. 16. עַל gives תשמור here an intensive sense. The connection only occurs elsewhere in Prov. v. 22, where it is taken *in bonam partem*. In both cases, it has the sense of *guarding* for the sake of *preserving*. The idea is that there is no need any more of guarding or watching *over* Job's sin, lest it should be lost, for it is *sealed up*—tied fast in God's *fasciculus*, or bundle (compare the same word, צרור, ver. 17, as used 1 Sam. xxv. 29, for the "*bundle of life*"). Such seems to be the train of thought, and it makes clear a passage which has been supposed to present no little difficulty in consequence of an apparent disagreement between its two clauses. The interrogatory rendering, as given in E. V., and elsewhere, is a forced help. The Vulgate regards לא תשמור as a prayer: *Do not watch over my sins—parce peccatis meis;* but that makes an unnecessary variance of construction between the two clauses and the two verbs תשמור and תספור. The word חָתֻם following gives a clue to the explanation.

[13] Ver. 17. **Sewest up.** Gesenius gives טפל a secondary sense suggested by the Greek phrase δόλον ῥάπτειν—"*to sew falsehood against my iniquity*." This suits Ps. cxix. 69; but there it is עָלַי, *against me*, against the person, not against the sin, which would be an absurdity. It would be here, moreover, an unnecessary departure from the other figures.

[14] Ver. 18. **Yes, even the mountain.** The expressive particle, אולם, as it occurs in Job, often denotes a kind of soliloquizing pause. It makes an emotional rather than a logical transition, suggestive rather than adversative. It may be supposed to refer to something thought, rather than expressed. What is the point of the comparisons that here start up in the mind of the musing, partly controverting, partly soliloquizing Job? It is a question which commentators have had difficulty in answering. The connective link would seem to be something suggested by the thought of deliverance from Sheol, ver. 15. But "*how long!* O Lord, how long!" as the Psalmist so expressively says. The mind of Job, beginning to fall back into its despondency, is led to a mental consideration of the slow changes of nature, and his breaking out with אולם is a sort of answer to the thought that had silently intervened: Ah, yes; God's times are long; the earth, too, and the heavens (see vers. 11 and 12) are passing away. "Yes, even the mountain falling crumbles to decay." The effect of this is to throw a shade over his hope, until at the end of the chapter he seems to have got almost wholly to his old despairing state.

[15] Ver. 18. In the version given there is an attempt to combine the two senses of עתק so closely suggestive of each other, namely *age* and *removal*. See Note ix 5.

[16] Ver. 19. **Wears the stones:** the pebbles on the beach made round and smooth by the ablution of the waters. It is a phenomenon suggestive, even to the most common mind, of long duration. One might almost fancy it a description of geological changes.

20 Thou overpow'rest[17] man, and he departs;
Changing his face, thou sendest him away.
21 His sons are honored, but he knows it not.
They come to poverty—he heeds it not.
22 By himself alone, his flesh endureth pain;
By himself[18] alone, his soul within him[19] mourns.

[17] Ver. 20. **Thou overpowerest.** DELITZSCH: "Thou *seizest him*," from an Arabic usage. The other rendering, though the verb occurs but in two other places, xv. 24 and Ecclesiastes iv. 12, gives a clear sense, and is to be preferred for its harmony with the figures of the context.

[18] Ver. 22. It reminds us of the wailing ghost in Homer. Job could hardly have believed it as a fact, and yet he seems here to have indulged the imagination of the body retaining feeling in the grave, and the soul, or life, in some way, sympathizing with it. It may be regarded, too, as an intensive expression of the dead man's indifference (see Ecclesiastes ix. 5, 6) to all things in the world above. There may, perhaps, be meant the supposed state in Sheol, according to the dark view taken x. 22, as though Job had fallen back to that gloomy conception, unrelieved by the hope that gleams out in some of the verses above.

[19] Ver. 22. **Within him.** Literally, *by him, upon him, very near to him.* The second עָלָיו, though a repetition of the one above, may be regarded as including both ideas. It is that thought of *continued being* referred to, INT. THEISM, pa. 3.

CHAPTER XV.

1 Then answered Eliphaz the Temanite and said,

2 A wise man, shall he utter windy lore?
And with a rushing tempest[1] fill his soul[2],—
3 Contending still with speech of no avail—
With words that do no good?
4 Nay more, thou makest void the fear of God,
Confession to Him ever holding back.
5 For 'tis thy sin that rules[3] thy mouth,
And thou thyself dost choose the crafty tongue.
6 I judge thee not; 'tis thine own mouth condemns;
Against thee thine own lips do testify.

7 Art thou the man who first was born?
Before the hills wast thou brought forth?
8 Eloah's secret counsel hast thou heard?
And kept (its) wisdom[4] to thyself alone?
9 Tell us—What dost thou know that we know not?
What insight hast thou, we have not the same?
10 The grey haired[5]—yea, the very old are ours—
One full of days, beyond thy father's years.

11 God's comfortings—are they too small for thee?
And speech that flows so gently[6] (to thine ear)?

[1] Ver. 2. **Tempest.** קָדִים. Literally the East wind (Eurus), but used for any violent blast (Hos. xii. 2; Isaiah xxvii. 8, בְּיוֹם קָדִים "*in the day of the East wind*"). In the first clause, as HEILIGSTEDT says, there is the idea of *inanity;* in the second, of vehemence.

[2] Ver. 2. **His soul.** בִּטְנוֹ. EWALD takes this literally, the *belly*, or *stomach*, as opposed to the *heart*. The Hebrew, however, as well as the Arabic word, is figurative of the most interior department of the soul; as in the phrase חדרי בטן Prov. xviii. and xxvi. 22. Same phrase Prov. xx. 27. Comp. Heb. iv. 12.

[3] Ver. 5. **Rules, or guards thy mouth.** So RASCHI, followed by SCHLOTTMANN and DILLMANN. The subject being general, the gender makes no difference.

[4] Ver. 8. (**Its**) **wisdom:** The deep wisdom of God, as spoken of xxviii. 23–27, which man cannot find.

[5] Ver. 10. שָׂב means the *hoary;* יָשִׁישׁ, one still older, and כַּבִּיר יָמִים (like the Arabic), one still older—as old as Job's father would have been.

[6] Ver. 11. **So gently.** לָאַט. The older versions and commentators made this a root, and gave it generally a bad sense, supposed to come from the idea of *involving, covering*—like the Syriac. Hence our E. V. renders it *a secret thing*

12 Why does thy heart[7] so carry thee away?
What means this quivering[8] of thine eyes?
13 That thou should'st turn again thy rage[9] on God,
Whilst pouring from thy mouth such words[10] as these?
14 Say, what is mortal man that he be pure!
Or one of woman born[11] that he be righteous?
15 For lo, His Holy Ones He trusteth not;
The very Heavens lack pureness in His sight,
16 How much more man, the abhorred,[12] the all defiled!
Yes, man who drinketh in, like water, his iniquity.

17 I'll show thee now the truth; give heed to me;
And that which I have seen will I report;—
18 What sages clearly have made known to us,
And kept not back—truths from their fathers learned;
19 The men to whom alone the land was given;
With whom had never mingled alien[13] blood.

[AND THUS THEY SAY.]

20 "The bad man sorely travails[14] all his days,—
The numbered[15] years that for the bandit wait.[16]
21 A sound of terrors ever fills his ears;
And then, when most secure, the invader[17] comes.
22 He has no hope from darkness to return,
And for the sword, he watches[18] evermore.
23 For bread he wanders, saying still—O, where!
A day of darkness, well he knows, is ready to his hand.

(some *horror*, or *mystery*). VULGATE: *verba prava.* Modern commentators, more correctly, make it from אט, or אטט, denoting something gentle, whether of sound or *motion*,—onomatopic, *at, at*, light moving. The preposition ל added makes it an adverbial phrase. See Isaiah viii. 6, "*the waters of Shiloh*," הַהֹלְכִים לְאַט, *that flow so gently.* In this second clause Eliphaz may have meant thus to characterize his own speech, referring probably to the opening words iv. 2, 3, 4. It is certainly not descriptive of the style they soon adopted.

7 Ver. 12. **Thy heart.** The *feeling* it must mean here, though לב more usually denotes *mind.*

8 Ver. 12. **Quivering.** The word רזם, or, as in Arabic and Syriac רמז, is generally rendered *to wink;* but here seems to denote that rapid, nervous, moving of the eye which is the sign of irrepressible agitation. The rendering, *rolling the eye*, as of anger or defiance, seems too harsh.

9 Ver. 13. **Thy rage;** רוחך, see Jud. viii. 3; Isa. xxv. 4: xxx. 28; Zech. vi. 8; Prov. xvi. 32; xxix. 11. EWALD, *Wuth.*

10 Ver. 13. HIERONYMUS: *hujuscemodi sermones.*

11 Ver. 14. **Of woman born.** Eliphaz here, as Job xiv. 1 and 4, seems to connect the *being born of woman* with the generic impurity—the erbsünde, or hereditary depravity.

12 Ver. 16. **The abhorred.** Exasperated by Job's refusal to make the demanded confession, Eliphaz goes much beyond the corresponding language used by him, iv. 19. There is a mingling of commiseration in that passage. Here it is the blackest painting lacking the tenderness of Paul.

13 Ver. 19. **Alien blood.** The Arabian claim of wisdom for purity of blood. See this well explained by DELITZSCH. See remarks on the conjecture of MERX, INT. THEISM, pa. 11.

14 Ver. 20. מִתְחוֹלֵל from חול, a very strong word—*tormented.*

15 Ver. 20. **Numbered years.** In such a connection מִסְפַּר denotes *fewness*, Numb. ix. 10; Deut. xxiii. 6.

16 Ver. 20. **Wait;** נִצְפְּנוּ, are *hidden*, laid up (see xiv. 13), *reserved.* So EWALD, whom the translator has followed in sense. There is, however, another rendering which has some claim, and which makes it an independent clause: the fewness of his years are *hidden*—unknown to the bandit. In the other מִסְפַּר is the time how long.

17 Ver. 21. **Invader.** שׁוֹדֵד, literally *waster* or *destroyer*, but most commonly used of an *invading host.*

18 Ver. 22. **Watches.** It is in form strictly the passive participle צָפֻן for צָפוּי, but it makes an intensive expression in whatever way we take it. "*Watched for the sword*"—preserved for it, *aufbewahrt*, EWALD. DELITZSCH and ZÖCKLER, "*selected,*" *ausersehen.* E. V., "*waited for of the sword.*" CONANT. "*destined.*" The idea among them all is that he is to die by the sword—kept for that death and no other. In this rendering the preposition אֱלֵי makes a difficulty, unless it be meant that the sword is watching *for him*, looking *towards* him. The same idea, however, may be obtained, and even more vividly, by taking another view of the word. The Vulgate renders it *circumspectans undique gladium*, as though they had read the active participle צֹפֶה. It may, however, be defended, without any textual change, by regarding צָפוּי here as we take יְדוּעַ, Isaiah liii. 3, in the phrase יְדוּעַ חֹלִי, literally, *known of pain;* rendered, *acquainted with grief, knowing pain—pain knowing him.* The construction is not exactly the same, but so near that one passage strongly suggests the other. UMBREIT gives it this active rendering: *und ängstlich schaut er nach dem Schwerte*, and compares it with Cant. iii. 8, כֻּלָּם אֲחֻזֵי חֶרֶב, literally, *all held of the sword*,—that is, *all holding the sword.* Such a construction of a passive verb or participle with an object, direct or indirect, is common in Greek.

24 Anguish and trouble fill him with alarm;
They overpow'r him like a chieftain[19] armed."

25 For that against the Strong,[20] his hand he stretched,
And proudly the Omnipotent defied—
26 Running upon him with the stiffened neck,
And with the thick embossments of his shield,—
27 For that his face he clothed in his own fat,
And built the muscle[21] thick upon his loin,—
28 So dwells[22] he in the ruined holds,
In houses uninhabited,
Fast hastening[23] to become mere rubbish[24] heaps.
29 Nor wealth he gets, nor do his means endure;
Nor shall his substance in the land extend.
30 From darkness nevermore shall he escape;
The scorching[25] flame shall wither up his shoots;
In God's hot anger doth he pass away.

31 Let him not trust in evil; he's deceived;
For evil still shall be his recompense;
32 Before his[26] time is it fulfilled,
His palm no longer green;
33 As shaketh off the vine its unripe grapes,
Or as the olive casts away its flower.
34 For desolate the gathering of the vile,
And fire devours the tents of bribery;
35 Where misery is conceived,[27] and mischief born;
And where the inmost thought deception[28] frames.

[19] Ver. 24. **Like a chieftain armed.** This rendering comes easy, if we regard כִּידוֹר, occurring only here, as simply another orthography for the more frequent כידון a spear (liquid ן for ר). In this view compare it with Prov. vi. 11, אִישׁ מָגֵן, *man of shield.*

[20] Ver. 25. **The strong.** There is not only an emphasis, but a climax in the divine names, אֵל and אֵל שַׁדַּי, as used here. The translator has attempted to preserve this in the etymological significance of אֵל. *Defied:* יתגבר *superbivit, contumax est.* Ver. 26, *with stiffened neck.* Compare Psalm lxxv. 6.

[21] Ver. 27. **Muscle thick upon his loin.** The word *muscle* as here used, is an accommodation to the sense. *Suet* or *tallow* would have been nearer to the Hebrew פִּימָה, but they would have been unpoetical to an English ear, besides making something like a tautology. פִּימָה (*pima*), is the Greek πιμελή, the covering or enveloping folds of fat generally, στέαρ (חלב), though sometimes the meanings seem reversed. The Greek πιμελὴ evidently means the enveloping fat, Soph. Antig. 1011. See President Woolsey's clear note upon the passage. Both figures here represent a man prospering, proud, and *wanton*—growing *fat* and *lusty.*

[22] Ver. 28. **So dwells he.** The translator has given וַיִּשְׁכּוֹן here a consequential sense, though in opposition to Delitzsch, Dillmann, Umbreit, Zöckler, and others. De Wette agrees with it in substance, in his rendering *darum bewohnet.* It is consistent, too, with Ewald's rendering of כִּי, ver. 27, as making a protasis (*Though he has covered*, or *if he has covered* (*Hab er sein Gesicht mit Fett bedeckt*). Rosenmüller, too, makes this inhabiting desolate cities a punishment, and, therefore, a *consequence.* The great difficulty in the other view is the making this dwelling in ruined cities, fast going to decay, one of the bad man's sins, all the more out of congruity, too, by coming so directly after that other sin of so different a character, represented in language figurative of pride, and insolent outward prosperity. Delitzsch and others make all of vers. 25, 26, 27, 28, the prodosis, and commence the apodosis, or consequence, with לא יעשיר, *he shall not be rich,* in the 29th: "Because he *stretched, etc.,*—and *ran*—and *covered*—and *abode in desolate cities—therefore, he shall not be rich.*" The latter part, at least, seems very unconsequential. The objection to the other view is answered by the fact that the conjunction ו may be truly *conversive,* and yet retain the consequential sense which it so frequently has,—connecting, indeed, but as a logical, instead of a mere eventual following. Whether this is so, in any case, is to be determined by the context, which here certainly seems greatly to favor it. As *conversive,* it simply makes the tense following take the *form* of the preceding, and such is the nature of conditional clauses in all languages that the question of *absolute times* becomes a matter of indifference as compared with the fact of the consequential relation. They may be in the past, or in the present, or in the aorist: *He made, etc.—therefore he dwelt:* Or, *he covers,* and therefore *dwells.* The English may be brought very near this Hebrew idiom by using a lighter transition particle than *therefore:* He *stretches out*—he *covers*—*so dwells he, etc.*

[23] Ver. 28. **Fast hastening.** The word יתעתדו has given commentators unnecessary trouble. Delitzsch renders it *appointed,* Conant, *destined,* which is better. The primary idea of the word is near futurity, something impending—*promptus, paratus* (עתיד). The Hithpahel is not passive, but reflex and intransitive.

[24] Ver. 28. **Rubbish heaps,** גַּלִּים. See Isa. xxxviii. 26: גלים נצים, *grass-grown heaps.*

[25] Ver. 30. **Scorching flame.** שַׁלְהֶבֶת, an intensive word; see Cant. viii. 6; Ezek. xxi. 3.

[26] Ver. 32. בְּלֹא יוֹמוֹ: *Its day not yet;* or prematurely.

[27] Ver. 35: **Is conceived.** The verbs are in the infinitive active, *to conceive, etc.,* but they are best rendered passively. Literally, at the *conceiving, etc.* Comp. Ps. vii. 15.

[28] Ver. 35. **Deception;** מִרְמָה; not *self-deceit,* as Delitzsch and Zöckler take it. That is too artificial.

Chapter XVI.

1 Then answered Job and said:

2 Of things like these, abundance have I heard.
Wretched consolers, surely, are ye all.
3 Is there an end at last of windy words?
Or what emboldens[1] thee to answer still?
4 Thus could I, also, speak as well as you;
If only your soul were in my soul's stead,
I too against you could array[2] my words,
Against you shake my head in scorn.
5 Thus with my mouth,[3] I too could strengthen you,
Whilst my lip solace held you (from despair)

6 Though I should speak, my grief is not assuaged;
If I forbear, what (pain)[4] from me departs?
7 Ah surely[5] now He hath exhausted[6] me.
Yes, thou hast made my household[7] desolate,
8 And shriveled[8] up my skin—a sight[9] to see.
My leanness (as a witness) rises up,
And answers to my face.

[A pause.]

9 His anger rends,[10] so fiercely it pursues.
He gnashes at me with his teeth.
It is my enemy;—on me he whets his eye.
10 (See how) they gape upon me with their mouths.

[1] Ver. 3. **Emboldens.** This sense of ימריצך is determined by vi. 25, 1 Kings ii. 8 (*Niph.*), and Mic. ii. 10, without going to the Arabic.

[2] Ver. 4. **Array, אחבירה.** The word on Hiphil means more than simply *joining*. It denotes association in bands (*fœdus junxit*), or a concert of speech and action between his assailants.

[3] Ver. 5. **Thus with my mouth.** E. V. inserts the adversative word *but*, giving a different turn to the sense; as though he had said: O, no; instead of, that I would have strengthened you. There is, however, nothing that warrants it. The style is direct, seemingly ironical, but full of pathetic reproach. The emphasis of the first clause is on *mouth*: with my *mouth* merely, and not from the heart. The same idea in the second clause in ניד שפתי. The words in brackets, or something like them, are but the complement of the idea. Three passages, Prov. xxiv. 11; Ps. lxxviii. 50; Job xxxiii. 18, to cite no others, place the meaning of יחשך here beyond doubt. In the first it is a holding back from slaughter (*rescuing*); in the second, from death; and in the third, from corruption. The word thus gets, even when standing alone, the general sense of *delivering* or *saving*. Conant comes nearest to this by rendering *uphold*. Delitzsch, to *soothe* (*lindern*), is without authority.

[4] Ver. 6. **What (pain) from me departs?** Literally, *what goeth from me?* but the reference to his unlessened sorrow is evident.

[5] Ver. 7. **Ah, surely now.** The pathetic participle אַךְ.

[6] Ver. 7. **Made desolate.** הֶלְאָנִי demands a stronger sense here than *weary*.

[7] Ver. 7. **Household.** So Conant and Delitzsch. It may be my *clan* or *tribe*, but here it is used of his household, because of its numbers: my domestic congregation. The sudden change of person increases the pathos.

[8] Ver. 8. **And shriveled up my skin.** E. V. gives the same idea: "*hath filled me with wrinkles.*" This rendering of קמט agrees with the Vulgate, and Delitzsch returns to it after it had been generally abandoned by the commentators. The word is common in the Syriac, where this sense of *wrinkling* is constant. See how it is invariably used in the Peschito Version of the Old Testament—Deut. xxxiv. 7 (*Moses' face was not wrinkled*), Ezek. vi. 9; xx. 53.

[9] Ver. 8. *A sight to see.* Literally *it is for a witness or a sign*—*ecce signum.* The accompanying action would probably be Job's showing them his emaciated countenance.

[10] Ver. 9. **His anger rends.** By most commentators the language here and in some of the verses below is used in reference to God. It is, however, not easy to believe that this is wholly so. Raschi says, without any seeming doubt on the matter, השטן הוא הצר, "*The enemy here is Satan:*" *Mine enemy sharpens his eye at me.* Job must have had some idea of a great persecutor who was not God, and who is spoken of in the Prologue. Or the two ideas may perhaps be mingled. Beginning to complain of God, as usual, the mind turns to this other adversary. Or it may be supposed that the imagination, in his half-maddened state (see Remarks on ix. 35), brings up before him the appearance of a furious mocking fiend, and then the picture takes the plural form. It is a company of fiends: *They gape upon me with their mouths;* and that brings out the language of ver. 11: *God hath delivered me unto the evil one; he hath cast me off into the hands of the wicked*, or the *malignant;* the word עויל being used very much as the New Testament uses ὁ πονηρός. Some of this language may have reference to his human accusers, such as the second and third clauses of ver. 10; but the other view is more in accordance with his frenzied state, or all these thoughts may be regarded as mingled together.

With scorn they smite me on the cheek;
As one, against me do they fill[11] their ranks.
11 Unto the evil one hath God delivered me;
Into the hands of the malignant[12] hath he cast[13] me forth.
12 I was at ease, and he hath shattered me;
Seized by the neck, and dashed[14] me to the ground;
Then raised me up, and set me for his mark.
13 His archers compass me about;
He cleaves my reins—he spareth not;
He pours my gall upon the earth.
14 He breaketh me with breach on breach;[15]
He runs upon me like a man of war.

15 I have sewed sackcloth on my skin;
My horn have I defiled with dust;
16 My face with weeping is inflamed;
And on my eyelids rests the shade of death.
17 For no wrong[16] I had done;
My prayer, too,—it is pure.
18 Earth cover[17] not my blood;
Nor let my cry find place (where it may rest).

[A PAUSE.]

19 Even now, behold! My witness[18] in the Heavens,—
Yea, my Attestor in the heights above!
20 My friends—'tis they who scorn;
Whilst unto God mine eye is dropping (tears),
21 That He[19] himself would plead for man with God,

[11] Ver. 10. **Fill their ranks.** By this rendering the nearly related Hebrew and Arabic senses of מלא are combined.

[12] Ver. 11. **Malignant.** So רשעים may be rendered, whatever application is given to it.

[13] Ver. 11. **Cast me forth;** ירט, once occurring, but having clearly the sense of the Arabic ורט, *precipitem dedit.* LXX ἔῤῥιψε.

[14] Ver. 12. **Dashed.** פצפץ, *dashed in pieces*—a very strong word. The context shows the action intended. The view we may have of this awful language, as spoken of God or Satan, does not affect the correctness of the translation.

[15] Ver. 14. **Breach on breach.** It can hardly be doubted that the reference here is to the calamity after calamity that Satan brought upon Job as told in the Prologue. It is certainly uncritical to suppose that Job's great enemy is wholly lost sight of in the subsequent chapters. Nothing, too, could be more undramatic.

[16] Ver. 17. **For no wrong I had done.** Compare the precisely similar construction Isai. liii. 9, על לא חמס, badly rendered: "*because* he had done no wrong"—rather: *for no wrong he had done.*

[17] Ver. 18. **Cover not my blood.** There seems certainly here the idea of the murderer and the pursuing avenger of blood. Can Job mean to speak of God in this way? or does he not rather intend the Evil One, by whose idea he seems haunted, whatever might have been the measure of his knowledge of such a being. In the Prologue, Satan appears as his murderer—the same who is called ἀνθρωποκτονος, John viii. 44—*a homicide from the beginning*—the old murderer who slew the human race. There seems to be something of the same cry against him, xix. 25. It is implied in the words: *I know that my Goel (my avenger), my Redeemer liveth—my nearest of kin.* The language immediately suggests the cry of Abel's blood.

[18] Ver. 19. **My witness.** This pathetic and solemn appeal to the Witness in the Heavens furnishes strong evidence that Job could not have had God in view in any of the harsh language which so marks this chapter.

[19] Ver. 21. **That He himself.** There can be no other subject for ויוכח than God, however strange the aspect it seems to give the sentence. Such is the view entertained by the best commentators, though some of them, like DELITZSCH, give the verb the sense of *deciding* (CONANT: *do justice to*), instead of the truer sense of *arguing, pleading for.* The pure, unmodified idea of the Hiphil is that of *arguing, reasoning, contending in words;* but whether *for* or *against* is to be determined by the context and the subject matter. It may mean the arguing of a mediator, an arbiter, or an advocate. The places in Job that are decisive of the meaning here are ix. 33: *There is no arbiter between us;* xlii. 3: where הוֹכֵחַ is equivalent to "speaking to, or pleading with the Almighty;" xiii. 15: "*I will defend my ways (plead my cause) before Him.*" Again, the preposition עִם in this place modifies it to the same sense as in chap. xxiii. 7. It is true that there the form is Niphal נוֹכָח עִמּוֹ, but that only gives it a middle or deponent bearing, without affecting the general idea. It denotes, in the Niphal, *mutual* pleading, *reasoning* together as in Isaiah i. 18. The present passage, and Job xxiii. 7, are the only ones where we find the verb connected with עִם, which seems consistent only with the sense of *arguing* or *pleading* for. The idea of *arguing against* would here be certainly much out of place. "*Deciding for*" (DELITZSCH), or "*doing justice to*" (CONANT), do not differ much from the idea of *arguing for*, but they unnecessarily mar the pathos of the passage, whilst DELITZSCH's rendering, "*against God,*" instead of *with God* (עִם), seems entirely unwarranted. It may present a difficulty to the Rationalist, this "*pleading of God*

As[20] one of Adam's sons doth for his brother plead.
22 For a few years will come and go ;[21]
And I shall go whence I shall not return.

with God;" but the mystery, the strange idea, contained in the tearful prayer which his extreme and helpless misery forces from the soul of Job is cleared up in the New Testament. UMBREIT also gives this translation, making God the subject of וְיוֹכַח, but the view he presents of it is certainly characteristic: "Job, in a melancholy, but ingenious way, says to God, that he must stand by him against God (Gott muss mir beistehen gegen Gott), for it is He who lets him suffer, and He is the only one who knows how innocent he is." Melancholy, indeed, it is to think how blind the otherwise acute eye of the Rationalist to the deep spirituality of a thought so tender, and at the same time so sublime!

[20] Ver. 21. **As one.** In וּבֶן the ו is comparative, as is often the case.

[21] Ver. 22. **Come and go.** The Hebrew אתה includes both directions, like the Greek ἔρχομαι. It demands here its full meaning.

CHAPTER XVII.

1 My breath is short ;[1]
My days are quenched ;[2]
The graves are waiting for me.
2 Were it not[3] that mockeries beset me round,
On their sharp taunts mine eye would calmly[4] rest.
3 Lay down[5] now ; be my surety[6] with thyself.
Ah ! who[7] is He that gives His hand for mine !
4 (Not they). Their heart from[8] insight Thou hast closed ;
Therefore Thou wilt not raise them (over me).
5 "When one for booty[9] friends betrays,
His children's eyes shall fail."
6 So, as a byword hath He set me forth,
Till I become the vilest[10] of the vile.

[A PAUSE OF SILENCE.]

7 Mine eye is dim from grief ;
My moulded[11] limbs are like a shadow, all.

[1] Ver. 1. **My breath is short.** It seems best here to follow the primary sense of חבל *to bind tight—funem adstrinxit, contorsit.* It is *stricture* and *shortness* in the breathing.

[2] Ver. 1. **Quenched.** דער=זער. Their light is gone out. See Prov. xiii. 9.

[3] Ver. 2. **Were it not.** אם לא makes a strong affirming when there is supposed to be a silent apodosis. It is a kind of imprecation, as though one should say coarsely, or strongly, "*I'll be cursed, if it is not so, or so.*" In this way it comes in Hebrew, and is very frequent in Arabic. There are two reasons against it here, though adopted by so many commentators: 1st, There is nothing in the context that demands anything so strong; 2d, the idea of a silent apodosis is not to be resorted to where there is an open one so clearly ex ressed. The conjecture may be hazarded that by *mockeries*, here, הֲתֻלִּים (*illusiones*) Job had in view the mocking fiends, whom his imagination, or something more real, perhaps had brought out, as in xvi. 9, 10—the "gaping mouths," the "gnashing teeth," the "glaring eye." They may be supposed to come from the same cause, whether it be his bodily or mental state, that produced the "scaring visions," vii. 14. It was these mocking illusions that drove him to frenzy. Were it not for these, he could more calmly bear the taunts of his friends, one of which may have been, perhaps, the very language which Job repeats from them, ver. 5.

[4] Ver. 3. **Calmly rest:** תָּלַן. *Literally, lodges;* in Kal., *pernoctare,* to *lodge all night.* DELITZSCH, *lingers;* CONANT, *dwells.* An affecting picture of helpless suffering—spoken of them, but addressed to God—as appears in next verse.

[5] Ver. 3. **Lay down now.** שִׂימָה: *lay down the pledge.*

[6] Ver. 3. **Be my surety.** עָרְבֵנִי; the same word used in Hezekiah's supplication, Isaiah xxxviii. 14. Addressed to God. The same wondrous thought we have xvi. 21.

[7] Ver. 3. **Ah who.** The interrogative מִי, here, does not so much express doubt as wonder at the thought of Him, the marvellous Surety.

[8] Ver. 4. **From insight,** that is, from seeing this mystery of God pleading with God for man, and becoming surety with himself.

[9] Ver. 5. **For booty,** לְחֵלֶק, *for a division of the spoil.* This verse looks like a proverbial saying which Job quotes against their faithlessness. In the direct order, as he gives it, it would be rendered thus:

For booty he betrays his friends;
His children's eyes shall fail;—

the second clause being consequential; as proverbs of this kind sometimes stand in Solomon's collection. We are compelled to supply a *relative,* or a *particle.* Or it may be that he is repeating, as before said, one of their own taunts or *bywords;* and thus suggesting the language of the next verse.

[10] Ver. 6. **Vilest of the vile.** תֹּפֶת is literally *a spitting,* or something *to be spit upon;* one on whose face any one may spit; (onomatopic like Greek πτύω). In such a case as this, translating literally is translating falsely, if it gives the modern reader the idea that there is meant the very action lexically expressed. It is not easy to believe that Job's face was actually spit upon; and therefore it is best to render the phrase by what it represents, and of which the *action* itself, as pictured, may be called the *language.*

[11] Ver. 7. **My moulded limbs,** וִיצֻרַי—from יצר to *form, fashion.* The contrast between his limbs in their original form and proportion, and their shrunken state.

8 The upright, sure, will be amazed at this,—
The innocent be roused against the vile;
9 But still the righteous man holds on his way;
The clean of hand still goes from strength to strength.
10 But come now, all of you; come on I pray;—
Among you all no wise man can I find.

[PAUSE].

11 My days are past,
My plans asunder[12] rent,
My soul's most cherished thoughts.
12 For day, they give[13] me night,
To the face of darkness light is drawing[13] near.
13 If I should hope, Lo, Sheol is my home.
Yes, in the darkness have I spread my couch.
14 To corruption have I said—my father thou;—
My mother and my sister—to the worm.
15 And where, then, is my hope?
My hope, alas![14] who seeth it?
16 To the gates[15] of Sheol it is going down,
When once it finds a resting place iu[16] dust.

[12] Ver. 11. **Asunder rent,** נתקו. The figure of the weaver's loom; UMBREIT. Compare Isaiah xxxviii. 12.

[13] Ver. 12. **They give—light is drawing near.** ישׂימו.—*They put.* But who are *they?* See Note Job vii. 3. They may be the invisible enemies whom Job fears to name; or if he refers to the friends it may be with a like aversion. The first is the more probable. The common grammatical explanation: *the active used for the passive*, is an evasion. Many commentators almost reverse the sense above given, by supposing Job to have represented the sophistical reasoning of the friends: "*They put* (as they suppose) *day for night*" DELITZSCH, "*They explain night as day*,"—a very forced rendering. UMBREIT: "*They would change night into day*"—that is, encourage and flatter Job. They had never done this, or, in any way, tried to make things look fair to him; since the verses, ch. xi. 16-19, are only conditional predictions. There seems, moreover, no good reason why ל in ליום may not have the sense above given to it as most literally translated: *for day—instead of day.* The second clause, too, has been made more difficult than would seem necessary. It is true that in Hebrew the preposition following קרב is usually ל or אל; but in such a case as this, there is nothing unnatural in regarding it as denoting a short distance *from*, so as to make מ the proper preposition—just like the Latin *prope abest.* The light is near (that is but a short distance *from*) the face or edge of the darkness (see Job xxvi. 10), like the sun in an eclipse just going into the penumbra, or into the total shadow. And this agrees admirably with the context. Relationally, ל and מ, though seeming opposites, are so near akin that they are sometimes united to denote both *from* and *to* the point which may be regarded as either that of contact, or of separation: As Deut. iv. 32, למן היום, 2 Sam. vii. 1; Haggai ii. 18, and other places, for which see NOLDIUS, *Concord. Partic.*, pa. 441. The naturalness of this is more easily acknowledged when it is considered that the Arabic verbs of nearness are generally followed by מן instead of אלי, and especially is this the case with this very verb קרב, where it has the sense of being near (*propinquus fuit*). Near *from*, they say, instead of near *to*. This seems to be SCHLOTTMANN'S rendering, and CONANT'S expressive version is closely allied to it: "*light is just before darkness*,"—just going out. DILLMANN and others take מ as comparative: *näher als das Angesicht der Finsterniss;* but this makes no clear sense.

[14] Ver. 15. **Alas!** The interjection is justified by the pathos of the repetition: *My hope;* yes, *my hope*, alas; with the emphasis on the pronoun.

[15] Ver. 16. **Gates**: בדי. UMBREIT, ROSENMUELLER, and others, render it *solitidudines* (*Oeden*), deriving the idea from the supposed primary sense of בד, בדד (לבד, *solus*). But the better view comes in another way—from the true primary sense of *separation.* So most distinctly the Arabic בַּד. Hence the sense of *vectes, bar, that which separates*, so often used in Exodus, *etc.*, in the description of the tabernacle. Hence it may well be rendered *gates*, as above, giving an idea the same with the שערי מות *gates of death* (*gates of Sheol*) Job xxxviii. 17; Ps. cvii. 18. It is the idea of returnlessness—

> The undiscovered country, from whose *bourn*,
> No traveller returns.

HOMER uses this same figure of gates or bars. See Iliad xxi. 72, πύλας Αΐδαο, *the gates of Hades.* In the Odyss. xi. 571, Hades is called εὐρυπυλὲς δῶ, "the house of the *wide gates* to indicate the vast population it encloses." There is the same idea of *separation* in a strange Arabic word Barzach, meaning the *interstice*, or separating interval, whether of space or time, between the present and the coming world. Among other places in the Koran, see Surat. xxiii. 102. "Behind them stands the *Barzach*, until the day of the Resurrection."

[16] Ver. 16. **In dust.** על עפר, here, must have the same meaning with לעפר, vii. 22.

Chapter XVIII.

1 Then answered Bildad the Shuhite and said,

2 How long will ye thus make of words a prey?[1]
First clearly understand; then let us speak.
3 Why are we counted as the beasts,
And held as worthless in thine eyes?
4 See—in his rage, it is himself he rends.
For thee shall earth be desolate?
The rock move from its place?

5 Yet true it holds;[2] the sinner's light is quenched;
And from his fire no kindling spark shall shine.
6 The sunshine darkens in his tent;
The lamp above him goeth out;
7 His steps are straitened,[3] once so firm;
And his own counsel headlong[4] casts him down.
8 By his own feet he's driven to the net;
In his own chosen[5] way there lies the snare.
9 The gin shall seize him by the heel;
The noose shall hold him fast.
10 His cord lies hidden in the earth;
His trap in ambush by the wayside path.
11 All round about do terrors frighten him;
[At every step] they start him to his feet.
12 His woe[6] is hungering for its prey;
A dire disease stands ready at his side;—
13 To eat[7] the very partings of his skin;
Yea, Death's First Born[8] his members shall devour.
14 Torn from his tent, his strong security,
Thus to the King of Terrors[9] doth it march him on.

[1] Ver. 1. **Of words a prey.** קִנְצֵי מִלִּים, *huntings* or *catchings* of words. For this rendering see the conclusive reasons given by Ewald and Delitzsch. **How long will ye:** It is addressed to all. Bildad makes the shortest speeches, and he reproves the other two, as well as Job, for their prolixity.

[2] Ver. 5. **Yet true it holds.** גַּם, *yea, verily, so it is.* Umbreit, *allerdings.* It is the view so often presented by him and the others in opposition to an opinion, which they suppose Job to hold, that God favors the wicked. This misunderstanding gives the key to much of their language. See Int. Theism, pa. 33. Bildad means to reaffirm it in spite of all Job may say.

[3] Ver. 7. **Straitened.** Comp. Prov. iv. 12.

[4] Ver. 7. **Casts him down.** Comp. Job v. 13.

[5] Ver. 8. **His own chosen way.** The Hithpahel, יתהלך, denotes one's way of life whether good or bad. (Comp. Gen. v. 22; xvii. 1, *etc.* Ps. xxxix. 7, *et al.*) There is also in the Hithpahel more or less of the reflexive sense—the way of his choice—and that makes a parallelism with the verse above—"*by his own feet.*"

[6] Ver. 12. **His woe.** The rendering *strength* here as though it were אֹן, *vires*, instead of the *construct* of אָוֶן, *calamity, trouble*—makes no satisfactory sense. It is adopted by Conant from E. V., and maintained by many commentators, Ewald, Dillmann, Merx, Rosenmueller, *et al.* Hirzel and Delitzsch make it construct of אָוֶן, though the rendering of Delitzsch much obscures the idea. The Vulgate renders it *strength: attenuetur fame robur ejus.* The Syriac (Peschito) the best of the old versions, especially of Job, gives the rendering the translator has adopted, "*his sorrow* shall be hungry:" It hungers after him like a ravenous beast ready to devour." See the figures ver. 13.

[7] Ver. 13. **To eat.** The *Fut.* form יאכל, in its connection here with the preceding verse, has the force of the infinitive.

[8] Ver. 13. **Death's first-born.** It is an awful personification. Diseases are Death's sons, but the strongest among them, the mighty first-born, is the terrible elephantiasis. If Bildad really meant Job's disease, and Job himself, as the true subject of such a fearful picture as he has drawn, then may he indeed be regarded as coarse and cruel. Raschi has a strange idea here. The בדים, ver. 13, are Job's sons and daughters; מבטח, ver. 14, is his wife.

[9] Ver. 14. **King of Terrors.** *The awful King;* if we may thus render בַּלָּהוֹת, taking it, as most commentators do, for בהלות. As coming from בלה, it would mean strictly *king of wastings*, or of *emaciations*, which would make it in harmony with the idea of Death in the verse above: The Father of Diseases is the מלך בלהות. or as Homer would style him by a similar figure (see Odys. xi. 491):

15 Who dwell within his tent are none of his ;
And o'er his pleasant[10] place is showered[11] the sulphur-rain.
16 Beneath,—his roots dried[12] up—
Above,—his branch cut off.—
17 His memory perished from the land,—
No name now left in all the plain,—
18 From light to darkness do they[13] drive him forth ;
And chase[14] him from the world ;
19 No child, no seed, among his people left—
In all his habitations none escaped ;
20 Men of the West[15] stand wondering at his day ;
Men of the East with shuddering fear are seized.
21 Yes, such the dwellings of unrighteous[16] men ;
And such the place of him who knows not God.

βασιλεὺς νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν—king of the wasted dead, —the imagery being drawn from the last stages of emaciating disease in this life. It is the idea in the word אֲבַדּוֹן Job xxvi. 6; xxviii. 22. the *Abaddon* of Rev. ix. 11, or the one described, Heb. ii. 14, as *τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου.* If not in sound, yet in idea, would it be a more fearful epithet than the other, as calling up the *pallida Mors* of the classic poet, and, above all, that most awful image of *wasting, emaciating* disease, the *χλωρὸς ἵππος*, the "*pale horse*" of Rev. vi. 8, with "*him who sat thereon*, whose name was Death, and Hades following hard after him." The thought of *terror* merely, falls far below the soul-awing, yet still fascinating, power of such a representation.

Ver. 14. **Doth it march him on.** DELITZSCH says that "the '*it*' here is a secret power, as elsewhere the feminine prefix is used to denote the dark power of natural and supernatural events, though sometimes the masculine is thus employed." This would make it a kind of impersonal fate, or *fatality*, of which, it is true, there are some traces to be found in the book (see INT. THEISM, pa. 23). But there is no need of finding the subject of the verb תַּצְעִדֵהוּ in such an abstract conception. It may be regarded, in strict grammatical construction, as the *hungry woe*, or the *first-born of Death*, although the gender is changed to the feminine to make it more universal—the feminine in Hebrew thus supplying the place of the lacking neuter.

[10] Ver. 15. **His pleasant place,** or home, נָוֵהוּ.

[11] Ver. 15. **Is showered**: יְזֹרֶה, lit. *is scattered;* but here seems to denote a *shower* like that which fell on Sodom and Gomorrah.

[12] Ver. 16. **His roots dried up—his branch cut off,** *etc.* It makes it more vivid to render the verbs in this verse and the next, as participles with a nominative independent.

[13] Ver. 18. **Do they drive.** For such use of *they*, see Note vii. 3. Comp. Ps. xlix. 15, לִשְׁאוֹל שַׁתּוּ. *They put (or drive) them into Sheol.* Comp. also Job xix. 26.

[14] Ver. 18. **And chase.** The idea of Ps. xlix. 15 is also in Prov. xiv. 32, though there it is expressed passively, בְּרָעָתוֹ יִדָּחֶה רָשָׁע, "the wicked man is driven away in his wickedness."

[15] Ver. 20. **Men of the West.** For the reasons of this rendering, see UMBREIT, DELITZSCH, and others. CONANT, however, adheres to the old rendering.

[16] Ver. 21. **Unrighteous men;** עַוָּל: Here taken collectively.

CHAPTER XIX.

1 Then Job answered and said

2 How long grieve ye my soul ?
And crush me with your words .
3 Ten times it is that ye have stung me thus ;
Devoid of shame, ye act as strangers[1] to me.

4 Be it so, then, that I have erred ;
My error lodges[2] with myself.

[1] Ver. 3. **Act as strangers.** The translator abides here by E. V. The rendering is obtained by regarding תֶּהְכְּרוּ as the Hiphil of the Hebrew root נכר (the characteristic ה preserved) with the sense of the piel. SCHULTENS, according to GESENIUS, thus regards it as for תַּהְכִּירוּ with which he compares יַדְרִכוּ, Jerem. ix. 2. See also יַדְבִּקוּ, 1 Sam. xiv. 22; xxxi. 2. The later commentators generally get its sense from the Arabic הכר, and render it *stun*, or *confound*. But that is straining the Arabic word, which means simply to *affect with admiration*, besides leaving wholly unexplained the preposition ל that follows. This is quite natural to the Hebrew verb, and also to the really corresponding Arabic נכר; as in the V. *Conj.* תנכר ל, *to be estranged*, to act like a stranger to any one.

[2] Ver. 4. **Lodges.** תלין—*pernoctat—tarries all night.*

5 If still against me ye exalt yourselves,
And plead against me my reproach,—
6 Then be assured that God hath cast[3] me down;
'Tis He that overspreads me with His net.

7 Behold I cry of wrong, but am not heard;
I cry aloud, but there is no redress.
8 For He hath fenced my road; I cannot pass;
And darkness doth He set o'er all my ways.
9 My glory from me hath He stripped,
And from my head the crown removed.
10 On all sides doth He crush me; I am gone;[4]
And like a tree uproots He all my hope.
11 Against me doth He make His anger hot,
And counts me as His foe.
12 Together draw His troops;
At me cast up their way;
Around my tent they camp.
13 My brethren far away has He removed,
And mine acquaintance from me are estranged.
14 My kinsmen all have failed,
And my familiar friends forgotten me.
15 Domestics,—maidens,—as a stranger hold me now;
I am become an alien in their eyes.
16 Unto my servant do I call—he answers not;
I have to supplicate him with my mouth.
17 My temper[5] to my wife is strange,—
My yearning for the children that she bare.
18 Yes—even the very boys despise me now;

[3] Ver. 6. **Cast me down.** There is no need of going beyond, here, to get the sense of *injustice*, as some do. UMBREIT well renders it, *mich beugt, bent down, humbled me*. ZÖCKLER also gives it clearly by *gekrummet, crooked, or curved me*. There is indeed complaint in the next verse, but it does not amount to a direct charge of injustice. It may be said, too, that in the language of the 7th verse Job had the friends in view. It was their wrong he cried out against.

[4] Ver. 10. **I am gone**—וָאֵלַךְ. Compare a similar pathetic use of οἴχομαι by the Greek Dramatic poets. See *Soph.* Ajax, 896, οἴχωκ', ὄλωλα.

[5] Ver. 17. **My temper—strange.** That aversion in some sense is intended here cannot be doubted; but in what way is it signified? The translator had much doubt in respect to רוּחִי, rendered generally *breath*, but which he has here ventured to translate *temper*, as the word is used, Prov. xxv. 28, where it is indeed translated *spirit*, but in the sense of *passion, animus agitatus et commotus*. This agrees with the immediate context, as well as with what is said of the wife in the Prologue. His spirit was alien to her. She did not understand him, his mind, his feeling, his state of soul. When he said, "the Lord gave, the Lord hath taken, *etc*," she regarded it as stoical indifference. She knew nothing of the deep feeling underlying the declaration, his yearning for the lost as measuring the depth of his resignation, before insufferable bodily agony drove him to the outcry of chap. iii. (see Int. Theism, pa. 28). She said to him, "Curse God and die." She was not at all the woman to appreciate Job, and under a sense of this he might well say, that she had come to regard him with aversion; and perhaps she had wholly abandoned him. Certainly the absence of all such allusion to incidents mentioned in the prologue would be more strange than their presence. It would furnish an almost unanswerable argument to those who maintained the later authorship of the prose portion. With this rendering would well agree what follows if we keep the common familiar sense of חַנּוֹת, whether regarded as an infinitive (like שְׁמוֹת, Ezek. xxxvi. 3) or as a plural feminine noun—my *yearning*, or *yearnings*, my tender feelings for the dear ones lost, for my *desolate household* (see xvi. 7 and note). She repels me from her (he seems to say) even in the manifestation of my deepest grief. The sense of חנן is very uniform in the Hebrew—*tender feeling—gracious feeling*—a going out of the soul towards anything. Hence, in Hithpahel, a tender supplication for grace and mercy, coming like the nouns תְּחִנָּה and תַּחֲנוּן from the frequent Kal imperative חָנֵּנִי, *have mercy upon me*. Prayer is the saying over of this tender formula. The verb, it is true, has the direct accusative for its object; but in the infinitive it would require the preposition of direction, and none more appropriate than ל or אֵלַי. This is the preposition following it in Arabic; and here it may be remarked that there is hardly another case of two words of the same form, in Hebrew and in Arabic, that so closely agree in all their applications and derivatives. "*He was or became affected with a yearning, longing, or desire, or an intense emotion of grief or of joy:*" Such is the definition that Lane gives from an extended study of the most copious native Arabic Lexicons. This is the very spirit of the Hebrew root. The rendering רוּחִי my breath is not inconsistent with it. The breath may be taken for that which is most familiar in the personality; or if regarded as denoting offensiveness, it may be said to have caused the unfeeling woman to repel everything in him, even his *yearning* for, or any mention of, his lost children. To get this idea of offensiveness, however, we must give an unusual sense to זרה (strange) making it the same

They flout at me when I attempt[6] to rise.
19 Men of my counsel[7] from me all recoil;
And those I loved are turned[8] against the sight;
20 My bone fast cleaving to my skin and flesh;—
All shrunk[9] away the covering of my teeth!

with זרא *fastidium*, as used Numb. xi. 20. But they cannot be the same word, as א there is radical, and the word is evidently allied to the Arabic דרא, *to repel*. There is nothing in the Hebrew זר akin to *nausea*, and the peculiar offensiveness in Numb. xi. 10, arose from satiety, excessive familiarity, which is an idea the very opposite to that of strangeness. Carrying out the idea which is supposed to be intended in the first clause, many commentators give to חנות, in the second, a sense derived from another Arabic root *channa* (instead of *hanna*) with the sense of *fœtor*. The arguments against it are, 1, that חנן, in the usual sense, is a very common Hebrew word. The Hithpahel conjugation is in verse 16, immediately preceding, and the Kal is repeated twice in ver. 21, in almost immediate connection: חנני, חנני, *pity me, oh pity me, ye my friends*. The Arabic *channa* differs in the diacritical point, but to the reader's eye the word used is the same root in all these places of the same chapter, to say nothing of its very frequent occurrence in all other parts of the Hebrew Scriptures. This certainly makes it seem very improbable that the writer should have gone so far out of his way to get a very foreign and almost opposite meaning in this passage. What makes it stranger still, is that the Hebrew is well supplied with words to express this idea of fœtor. There is the very common באש with its derivatives, besides זנח, חזניח, which occurs more than twenty times, and another form צחן, Joel ii. 20. 2. The primary meaning of *channa*, as given by the Lexicographers, and especially by Lane, the most exact of them all (and who differs from them in his copious citation of illustrating passages) is "the emission of the breath, with a sound, through the nostrils." This shows that it is an onomatopic, *khanna*, a nasal sound, or utterance. If used to denote a disease, it would be something like the *catarrh*, or a cold in the head. 3. In getting this sense of *fœtor*, they take the remote Xth conjugation of *channa* (as given by Golius and Freytag, without any references): *fœtorem emisit puteus*—a sense which Lane relegates to the most unusual ones, and which is most probably dialectical, or coming from some incidental association of sound or otherwise. It is certainly very rare, not to be found in the Ancient Arabic, or in the later classical. It is not in the Koran, or in Hariri, or in Ahmed's Life of Timur, or in the copious Koranic commentary of Alzamakhshari. Besides this, it seems most likely to be derived from *sachana*, meaning *to be warm* (especially water). The VIIIth conj. of this root (*istachana*) would differ only by the doubling of the final consonant from the Xth of the other; and in the Arabic it sometimes happens that the derivative senses thus get mixed together, as *istachana* and *istachanna*. There is the same argument against bringing it from the Syriac חנינא, *rancidus*. It is found only in Castell without any citations. It may be a late derivative from the Arabic, but more likely a merely accidental accommodation from the old sense of חנן; hence in Syriac, חנינא, a name for a kind of oil (from the idea of smoothness) afterwards used for rancid oil. Any authority that this might seem to possess is invalidated by the fact that the Peschito Syriac translators would have found this word *hanino* (had it been old Syriac) the very one to be used if *fœtor* were the real meaning intended. Instead of this, they have used the old Hebrew and Syriac חנן, and given precisely the rendering of our E. V. (אתחננת), "I *entreated, supplicated* for the children of my bowels."

A strong argument against this later rendering of *fœtor*, offensiveness, is that, in consequence of demanding for ל the sense of *to*, instead of *for*, or *on account of*, it makes it impossible that בני בטני (2d clause) should mean the children of Job, for they were all dead. Attempts have been made to refer it to children of slaves, *etc.*, but this is too far-fetched to deserve notice. Umbreit and Delitzsch regard בטני as referring to his mother's womb, called *my* womb (as in iii. 10 דלתי בטני "doors of my womb"). Conant states the argument very well and concisely for this; but it does not satisfy. Job is not speaking of himself here, and so the argument from iii. 10, does not apply. In Micah vi. 7, פרי בטני certainly means children, and to get away from it by saying that in that case there is meant the womb of his wife is taking away all definiteness from the phrase, and making it mean anything an *exigentia loci* might demand. So with the phrase פרי בטנך *Deut.* vii. 13, which Delitzsch cites בטן means the womb only in a secondary application. Its primary sense is *belly*, *body* (Arabic בטן and כרן, used in the same way), the interior part; hence used, as in Job xv. 2, 35; Prov. xxii. 18; xviii. 8; xx. 27; xxx. 26; Hab. iii. 16, for the interior spirituality; see Note Job xv. 2. In this primary sense of body it is applicable to the male as well as to the female. And so it is rendered in E. V. *children of my body*. It is like בני מעי "*children of my bowels*," בני חלצי "*children* of my loins." The reference to his children, after the mention of his wife, is most natural; and it should be borne in mind that only four verses above, the brothers of Job, whether uterine, or collateral kinsmen more remote, are mentioned by their own appropriate name (אחי) as estranged from him, and *far removed*. They had abandoned him, and could not have been affected by any such offensiveness. The friends alone seem to have remained in close contact with him, and therein, with all their harshness, they were better than his wife and his brethren. Besides, that there should be no mention of children, would, indeed, be very strange. The difficulty clears up when we abide by the old rendering, whilst the mention of his dead children, and his yearning *for* them, in connection with his wife's aversion, becomes a most touching instead of such an offensive picture, as the other rendering would make it.

[6] Ver. 18. **When I attempt to rise.** אקומה: paragogic ה—subjective or optative sense—*when I would rise*, indicating a feeble attempt, as he sits upon the ground, or *among the ashes*, ii. 8. The boys mock his emaciated form and tottering motions.

[7] Ver. 19. **Men of my counsel,** מתי סודי. See Psalm lv. 15, "*With whom I took sweet counsel.*"

[8] Ver. 19. **Are turned against the sight.** The rendering is not too full for the Heb. נהפכו—*are turned right round*, or *right away*. It implies a revolting sight, brought out in all its ghastly features in the next verse.

[9] Ver. 20. **All shrunk away.** This verse has given rise to much and varied comment. The things first to be determined are the meaning of the phrase עור שני (*skin of my teeth*) and the meaning and construction of the verb אתמלטה. The idea of Delitzsch that the first means the *periosteum*, a fibrous membrane surrounding the bone, is *far-fetched*, and could not have been thought of by Job. No meaning can be given to the phrase unless it be the lips or gums surrendering the teeth,—*the covering of the teeth*. There is no reason here to go beyond the primary sense of the verb מלט. Both in the Hebrew and in the Arabic, as well as in the cognate פלט it is that of *smoothness* (*levis, glaber fuit*, Ges.) *bareness, slipperiness*. Hence *elapsus est, evasit*, he *slipped away*, he *escaped*. There is the same primary idea in the English *escape*. As an escape from danger, however, or difficulty, it is a secondary sense, and found only in the Niphal (the Piel and Hiphil being causative of it). The Hithpahel occurs nowhere else except in this passage, and its reflex form and sense, as will appear, favor the idea above given. The next thing is to examine the Ancient Versions. The Peschito Syriac gives the sense of E. V. The Vulgate, or Hieronymus, renders it *derelicta sunt tantummodo labia circa dentes meos*, only the lips are left about my teeth—left as something abandoned or deserted. The LXX. ὀστᾶ μου ἐν ὀδοῦσιν ἔχεται, which has little or no sense. In the Hexaplar Syriac Version of the LXX. we find in the margin the rendering of the other early Greek versions. Aquila gives it as in E. V. and the Peschito. Symmachus: "*I am hung*," or, *I adhere to the skin of my teeth*. Theodotion: *I am abandoned of* (*forsaken by*) *the skin of my teeth*. Tremellius has the same rendering as E. V. Luther: und kann meine Zähne mit der Haut nicht bedecken. This, with the version of the Vulgate and Theodotion, is the general idea above given, though differently expressed: the teeth exposed and protruding. Stickel and Hahn (as cited and contested by Delitzsch) arrive at a similar idea, but in a wrong way, by making עור the infinitive of ערר with the sense of nakedness. The difficulty appears to be in the first person of the verb. The sense given would seem to demand the third per-

21 Have pity; O have pity—ye my friends;
For 'tis Eloah's hand that toucheth[10] me.
22 But why, like God, should ye pursue?
And not be satiated[11] from my flesh?

[PAUSE.]

23 O, that my words were written now;
O, that they were upon the record graved,
24 With pen of iron, and of lead,—
Upon the rock cut deep—a witness evermore.

[A BRIEF SILENCE].

25 I KNOW THAT MY REDEEMER[13] LIVES;
AND O'ER MY DUST,[14] SURVIVOR,[15] SHALL HE STAND.
26 MY SKIN ALL GONE, THIS[16] [REMNANT] THEY MAY REND;
YET FROM MY FLESH SHALL I ELOAH SEE;—
27 SHALL SEE HIM MINE;—
MINE EYES SHALL SEE[17] HIM—STRANGER[18] NOW NO MORE.
(For this) with longing faints my inmost[19] soul.

son with עור for the subject: *the skin of my teeth has slipped off*—or, *slipped off from my teeth.* It will be seen, however, that the other is the more touching mode of expressing it, and that this arises from the personal reflex sense of the Hithpahel, whilst it also accounts for that form being used. "*I am smooth, I am parted, I am bare*, denuded, or *slipped off*, as to (or in) the skin (or *covering*) of my teeth," seems indeed a very awkward kind of language, and yet it corresponds to the literal English of a very common Greek idiom, found more or less, too, in other languages, and having a natural philosophical as well as philological basis. It is the ascribing to the whole personality a particular act, state, or affection, which affects primarily only a part of the body. The verbs which take such a construction are most commonly middle or deponent corresponding to the Hebrew Hithpahel, or they are intransitive though active in form. Thus, instead of saying *my tooth* aches, they would say, I ache as to my tooth, I am shorn, my head, or as to my head—the preposition κατὰ being generally implied, though sometimes expressed, as ב is expressed here in בעור, yet still preserving the same idiom. In regard to verbs denoting pain, it seems more phisophical than our method; since a pain in any part is a pain to the whole. But the Greeks carry it much further, as expressive of states and actions. Thus they would say, without difficulty, ἀποτέμνομαι τὴν χεῖρα, or as one says, in the Clouds of Aristophanes 24, ἐξεκόπην τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν. *I was knocked out, my eye*, or *as to my eye*, instead of saying *my eye was knocked out.* See also ARISTOPH. *Aves.* 334. The preposition in בעור does not affect the idiom. With or without it, it is equally the *case* or *condition*, according to the technical name which the native Arabian Grammarians have invented for one of the aspects of this idiom, which is as frequent in the Arabic as in the Greek.

The other rendering: "*I am escaped with the skin of my teeth*," seems to have but little meaning, though so strongly defended. From our English it has acquired a sort of proverbial sense—the barest escape from danger; but this is inapplicable to Job. The Arabic formula so commonly cited in its defense: "he escaped with his head," differs in the most important item. Head is, in many languages, used for *life;* and thus it becomes an expression of exultation, or at least of self-congratulation. But this would be most inconsistent in the case of Job. He does not speak like one who has *escaped* (got through his trouble), even with difficulty. And then that piteous cry which immediately follows: *hanéni, hanéni, oh my friends, for it is Eloah's hand that toucheth me.* could only have come from a sense of his forlorn, hopeless condition—his projecting bones, his shrunken skin, his protruding teeth, *denuded* of their once comely covering—all presenting a woful spectacle of misery and wild despair.

There is another view cited by UMBREIT from *Michaelis' Supplem.*, p. 1512, in which a meaning for the Hebrew verb is sought from a secondary sense of the Arabic coming from the common primary idea of *smoothness* or *bareness.* It is *pilis caruit*, or *nudavit pilis* in Conj. II., *smoothing off the beard*, like Hebrew מרט. Hence by the *skin of the teeth*, he would understand the covering beard, which has all come out in consequence of the disease. But this is an interpretation on which there is no need of dwelling.

[10] Ver. 21. **That toucheth me,** נגעה בי. The apparent lightness of the act enhances, by its mighty effect, the greatness of the power: "He *looketh* at the earth, and it trembles; He *toucheth* the mountains, and they smoke (*the Volcanoes*)." Comp. Ps. cxliv. 5.

[11] Ver. 23. **Satiated.** The idea intended is that of remorseless slander compared to a devouring of the flesh. In the SYRIAC it becomes a fixed idiomatic expression for this idea. Hence a Syriac word, אכלקרצא, meaning the *Devourer of pieces*, becomes a name for Satan, or Διάβολος, the Accuser.

[13] [14] [15] Ver. 25. [16] Ver. 26. For remarks on the words thus noted see *Addenda Excursus*, No. 1, p. . The three verses 25, 26 and 27 are printed in capitals to correspond to the idea of the monumental inscription (see Excursus I., p.) evidently designed in verses 23 and 24. The conjunction ו, with which it commences, as it stands in the book, does not interfere with this. In the monumental inscription read as standing by itself cut in the rock, the ו may be regarded as dispensed with, just as we leave out the Greek ὅτι which stands redundantly before a quotation in the New Testament.

[17] Vers. 26 and 27. **Shall see,** *etc.* Most worthy of note here as showing the earnestness and assurance of the speaker is the three-fold repetition of the verb to see, expressing three different aspects of the idea: 1. I shall see Eloah; 2. Shall see him *mine;* 3. *Mine eyes* shall see him. In the first two cases it is חזה, which is used more for spiritual vision, like ὄπτομαι in Greek. In the third it is ראו, connected with the organ as though denoting an actual visual beholding—*mine eyes* shall see him—the time of ראו depending on the picture preceding. Though we have two principal verbs of sight, the translator has used but one (*see* instead of *behold*), in order to present more strikingly this most significant repetition. WATTS: "*with strong immortal eyes.*"

[18] Ver. 27. **Stranger now no more.** DELITZSCH refers זר to Job: *I shall see Him not as a stranger sees Him*, or "I shall see him, and not *another*," as E. V. has it. So CONANT; also the LXX. and VULGATE: *et non alius.* But on the other hand, GESENIUS, UMBREIT (*doch nicht als Gegner*), VAIHINGER, STICKEL, HAHN and VON HOFFMANN refer it to God. DELITZSCH has no right to say that זר does not mean adversary. When applied to the relation between man and God, it does mean that most emphatically. There are two strong reasons for this interpretation which the translator has adopted: 1. The declaration: "*Mine eyes* shall see him," so strongly made, would render this interpretation of DELITZSCH a tautology—a saying the same thing (myself and not another), only in a more feeble way. 2. The other rendering brings into emphatic prominence the idea for which Job's soul was panting—not so much the sight of God by any objective beholding, as the idea of *reconciliation* with him—love and peace after estrangement. See this more fully dwelt upon in the excursus above referred to.

[19] Ver. 27. **(For this).** In respect to Job's rapturous emotion here, see Addenda Excursus I., p. .

[PAUSE.]

28 Yes, ye *shall*[20] say, why persecute we him?
And seek[21] to find in me a root[22] of blame?
29 Beware—Beware[23]—the sword.
For there is wrath; yea sins (that call) the sword;[24]
That ye may surely know that judgment[25] *is*.

[20] Ver. 28. **Shall say.** The supposing a pause of silence, however brief, before ver. 28 greatly facilitates the interpretation of what follows, and which by being brought abruptly in, has given rise to much unnecessary difficulty. The high feeling of the rapturous anticipation has somewhat gone down; but it has made a change in Job, and gives him strength to use a language to the friends different from what he had before employed. There is no recrimination, but he ventures to assume to them something of a warning, and even a prophetic style. It is, however, a general prediction, and there is nothing to show that he had in view the scenes narrated in the close of the book, as some have thought in order to lower the character of his ecstatic vision to a mere guess at returning prosperity. *For ye shall say.* There is no need of departing from the simple future sense of תאמרו. The time will come when ye will take a different view of the case. The כי is slightly illative, being used, as it repeatedly is, in the Book of Job, to denote a kind of reply to something that has been silently passing through the mind. It is like the commencement of Chap. xxviii. Thus regarded, the two verbs following (נרדף and נמצא) may both be treated as in the same conjugation and tense, future in form, but to be rendered as present, or aorist, depending on תאמרו; in which view there is no need of regarding ו in the second clause as anything more than simply connective. There is no inferential sense in it to be rendered *since* or *seeing that*; all of which arises from a wrong view of the connections of the passage.

[21] **Seek to find.** In kal מצא denotes not simply a *finding*, casually, but a finding what is sought. Here it may be taken as the 1st Pers. Plu. Fut. Kal, instead of the Niphal participle, which the other view seems to necessitate. The change of person, although it makes strange sounding English, the translator has preserved because it is so expressive in Hebrew, this sudden turn to himself as the object of their persecution. Comp. the precisely similar case, xiv. 3, which MERX has marred by his useless emendation of the text.

[22] Ver. 28. **Root of blame.** When this phrase, דבר שרש, is rendered *root of the matter*, it seems to have little or no meaning, besides necessitating a different and forced construction of the whole passage. It is in E. V., and maintained by DELITZSCH, CONANT, and other very able commentatórs; but an examination of the use of דבר in such passages as Exod. xviii. 16–22; xxii. 8 (עַל כָּל דְּבַר פֶּשַׁע), xxiv. 14, and other places, can leave little doubt of the meaning as above given—a ground of accusation or blame. It may have been שרש, *root* of accusation, as denoting charges inferred without evidence, like those in chap. xxii., —dug up—hunted for—having no proof upon the surface. ROSENMUELLER: *materiam litis*.

[23] Ver. 29. **Beware—Beware.** The repetition in the translation is justified by the great emphasis expressed in לכם and מפני: "Take care of yourselves before the sword." The strengthening that Job had received rouses him to give them this warning, though not at all in their style of crimination.

[24] Ver. 29. **(That call) the sword.** Comp. Romans xiii. 4. Literally, *sins of the sword*.

[25] Ver. 29. **That judgment is**—*surely is—really is*—or *what it* really is—said, perhaps, in opposition to their superficial views about the judgments or dealings of the divine providence: That ye may have an idea of the greater and higher judgment. We have here שׁ for אֲשֶׁר—the only place in Job where it occurs, though so common in Ecclesiastes and the later Hebrew.

CHAPTER XX.

1 Then answered Zophar, the Naamathite, and said:

2 To this[1] my thoughts compel[2] me to respond;
And therefore is my haste[3] within me (roused).
3 The chastening of my reproof I hear;
'Tis zeal,[4] with knowledge, urges my reply.

[1] Ver. 2. **To this.** לכן. There is no need to follow UMBREIT and others in their far-fetched explanations of this particle, ל—כן. *Literally to so—for so—for this—there-for* or *therefore*. So על כן, *wherefore*. It denotes here an immediate reply. Fired by Job's saying to them *to beware of the sword of justice*, Zophar answers indignantly and impetuously. He could be very calm when, free from pain, he discourses so loftily and truly about God's wisdom and "truth's two-fold form" (chap. xi. 6). With all theoretical coolness could he exhort Job to repentance. But now when the sufferer, strengthened by his glorious hope (xix. 25–28), turns upon them, as it were, and warns them that they too have need of repentance, Zophar goes off in great *haste*, as the next clause shows. This heat is continued through the chapter, producing that picture of the wicked man and his doom, most just in itself, and most graphically as well as eloquently presented, but very intemperate and unjust as applied to Job.

[2] Ver. 2. **Compel me to respond.** ישיב alone might mean simply to answer, but the suffix and the context seem to demand the *causal* sense. It might, however, be rendered *furnish my answer—give me an answer*.

[3] Ver. 2. **My haste.** There is no need of going away from the pure Hebrew sense of חוש, *haste*. It is just what the context shows to be wanted, and the word in brackets is simply the expression of what is implied in the emphatic repetition, חושי בי, of the first person: *my haste in me*.

[4] Ver. 3. **Zeal.** רוח is here used for *anger*, *temper*, *zeal* or *warmth* (*ira*), as it is Judg. viii. 3; Prov. xvi. 32; Isaiah xxv. 4; xxx. 28; Zech. vi. 8. He justifies this outburst of *spirit* by the following word, מבינתי, *from my* understanding. It is not irrational anger, he would say, but justified by Job's provocation.

4 Ha![5] knowest thou this—a truth of olden time,
Since Adam first was placed upon the earth?
5 How brief the triumph[6] of the bad!
The joy of the impure, how momentary!
6 Yes, though his pride may mount to heaven's height,
His head reach to the cloud;
7 As is his splendor,[7] so his hopeless[8] ruin;
Who gazed upon him say—where is he gone.
8 As a dream[9] he flies, and is no longer found;
Like a night spectre[10] is he scared away.
9 The eye hath glanced[11] on him—it glanceth not again;
His dwelling-place beholdeth him no more.

10 His children must appease[12] the poor;
And his own hands give back again his wealth.
11 His bones are filled from sins[13] in secret done,
And with him in the dust must they lie down.
12 Though wickedness, while in his mouth, be sweet;
So that beneath his tongue he keeps it hid,—

[5] Ver. 4. **Ha!** The Hebrew ה in הזאת is exclamatory as well as interrogative. It is often so. Here it strikingly shows how impetuously Zophar dashes on after his hasty exordium. The force of it is carried all through the high-wrought picture that follows. He begins as though he would overwhelm the unrepentant and presumptuous Job.

[6] Ver. 5. **The triumph—the joy.** These expressions would seem to refer to Job's exultant hope, xix. 26, 27, and his warning, ver. 29.

[7] Ver. 7. **As is his splendor.** Ew.: *nach seiner Grosse.* The weight of authority is in favor of this rendering, as derived from tho Arabic, גלאל, *glory, splendor.* The Chaldaic גלל has the same meaning. It avoids the seemingly indecorous comparison of the E. V. rendering, and has, moreover, in its favor the fact that the Arabic word, thus used, is very common. It may be said, too, that the contrast thus given more strongly expresses the main idea, which is his great downfall. The suffix, too, as CONANT well remarks, is better adapted to this rendering.

[8] Ver. 7. **Hopeless ruin.** Literally, *so he perishes utterly.* לנצח does not mean *forever* in the *time* sense, but only implies it in its real idea of *completeness, finality.* The verb אבד suggests strongly that awful word *Abaddon* (אבדן), the state of *the lost.*

[9] [10] Ver. 8. **As a dream——As a night spectre.** The rendering is demanded in order to give the true distinction of the words חלום and חזיון. The first is simply an ordinary *dreaming*, especially in a light sleep, which seems to fly away on opening the eyes (*volucrique simillima somno*), and we cannot recall it. We only know that we have been dreaming. So the wicked man, after his brief hallucination, *cannot be found.* Literally: *They cannot find him.* The other clause of the parallelism is much stronger. חזיון denotes a vision as something different from such a mere dreaming. Again, it denotes the object of the vision, as well as the vision itself; like the Greek ὄψις (from ὄπτομαι, corresponding best to Heb. חזה), which means the *sight* (*spectaculum*), as well as the *seeing.* This is generally something mysterious and sublime, as in Job iv. 13, or something frightful, as in Job vii. 14: "Thou *scarest me with visions*"—*phantasms, spectres, frightful sights.* The vision of Eliphaz (iv. 13–17), whatever degree of objective reality we may ascribe to it, is certainly evidence of a belief in a spectral world, from which came forth things to warn or to terrify men. The rendering *spectre* is strongly favored by the word following. The verb יֻדַּד is literally *driven, chased away*, as E. V. and CONANT render it, but *scared away* is most fitting to the context: and so the German commentators, such as UMBREIT, EWALD, ZÖCKLER, *etc.*, mainly render it (*verscheucht, fortgescheucht*) *weggescheucht.* Everything about the passage shows that it was an ancient as well as a modern superstition, if we may call it so, that apparitions from this spectral world departed very suddenly as though frightened, either by the crowing of the cock, or the appearance of morning, or something stern and bold in the human attitude towards such seeming intruders. This is remarkably exemplified by the story Plutarch gives us, in his life of Brutus (sect. xxxvi.), of the apparition (*the nachtgesicht*) that presented itself to him when reading in his tent at midnight before the battle of Philippi. "Whilst in deep study, he seemed to *feel* the presence of something entering. Turning his eye, he sees a strange and fearful form of something ἐκφύλου (belonging to no known species), standing in silence by him. Who art thou, man or god? The phantasm replies, in a hollow tone, I am thy evil genius, Brutus; thou shalt see me at Philippi. I will see thee there, said he." This bold answer of Brutus, as though making an appointment, and the fright of the spectre, is most admirably paraphrased by Cowley:

I'll see thee there, saidst thou,
With such a voice and such a brow,
As put the startled ghost to sudden flight;—
It was as though it heard the morning crow,
Or saw its well-appointed star
Come marching up the eastern hill afar.

So flies the wicked man, *scared away, driven away*, by the divine judgments, or when the light of truth is let into his soul. The rendering, *chased away*, also reminds us of Prov. xiv. 32: "*The wicked man is driven away in his wickedness.*" This kind of language has a number of examples in Job, and it may be taken as proof that the phraseology in the Proverbs is derived from it.

[11] Ver. 9. **Hath glanced.** שזף. A word rare, but clear. Cant. i. 6: "The sun hath looked upon me"—to change my color. Job xxviii. 7: "The keen falcon's eye hath *glanced* upon it"—the miner's unexplored path. ZÖCKLER gives this very strikingly: ein Auge hat auf ihn geblickt, es thut's nicht wieder. Nothing could more distinctly express the idea of *transitoriness:* one glance, and he is never seen again.

[12] Ver. 10. **Must appease.** This is the rendering of E. V. (*seek to please*). The argument for it, besides the grammatical one, is the harmony it makes with the second clause. The other rendering, *the poor shall oppress his children*, demands a new form of the verb רָצַץ=רָצָה.

[13] Ver. 11. **Sins in secret done.** Literally *secret things;* but a comparison of Ps. xc. 8 shows at once the meaning. Many render it *sins of youth.* There is authority for it from the use of עלום, Ps. lxxxix. 46; Job xxxiii. 25, *etc.*, but the general sense here is best, especially as it may also include the other, and perhaps point to them. *Secret sins, or sins of youth*—the effects of them go with a man to his grave. *They lie down;* תשכב; singular feminine, but answers for a collective nominative, like a Greek singular verb with a plural neuter to which the Hebrew feminine, in such cases, corresponds.

13 Sparing it long, and loth to let it go,
Holding it back, still near his palate's taste;
14 Yet in his bowels is his bread all changed;
Within him, 'tis the very gall of asps.
15 The wealth he swallows shall he vomit up,
Yes, from his very maw shall God's hand cast it forth.
16 The venom of the viper shall he suck;
The adder's tongue shall slay him.
17 On the fair rivers[14] shall he never gaze,—
The flowing streams of honey and of milk.
18 Toil[15] [wronged], before 'tis swallowed, he restores;
As wealth exchanged, he has no joy of it.
19 Because[16] he crushed, and helpless left, the poor;

[14] Ver. 17. **On the fair rivers.** פְּלַגּוֹת here, and Judges v. 15, 16, is synonymous with פְּלָגִים, and means primarily artificial water courses, but the word is used of rivers generally, as in Ps. lxv. 10, פֶּלֶג אֱלֹהִים, *the river of God.* It is used to denote a beautiful, fair-flowing stream, as נָהָר represents a fuller and deeper one, or as the Latin *amnis* in distinction from *flumen* or *fluvius.* **The flowing streams;** literally, *flowings of streams;* the first noun qualifying the other—the *full streams.* Is anything special meant here, or is it only a glowing picture representing wealth and prosperity? The latter view seems easy, and is the one generally taken by commentators; but yet it has great difficulties. In the first place, the whole picture is not that of a poor man who never attains to any measure of luxury, but of one who has possessed, and then been deprived of it. In the second place, if Zophar has Job in view, as we must suppose from the way he brings in the picture, the language, thus understood, is wholly inapplicable. With his "seven thousand sheep and goats, and three thousand camels, and five hundred yoke of oxen, and five hundred she asses, and very many servants," he must be said to have seen "the brooks of honey and milk," that is, abundance of the luxuries of life, or of the good things of this world, if ever a man did. The conjecture may be hazarded, that the fervid and imaginative Zophar has in mind some early Arabian mythical paradise, something unearthly, or belonging to some remote region of the world, like the Greek "Isles of the Blessed." Thus viewed, it may have been the origin of that description we find so often in the Koran, and which must have been much older than the days of Mohammed. See *Surat.* ii. 23: "For them are the gardens where flow *the rivers," etc.,* and many other places. In *Surat* xlvii. 16, 17, the language becomes almost identical, in some respects, with that of the passage in Job: "Like the garden promised to the pious, wherein are *rivers of living water* (water that never loses its purity), and *rivers of milk* whose taste never changes, and *rivers of honey* purified, and fruits of every kind, and forgiveness from their Lord." If Zophar had any such idea derived from any quarter, it may have resembled the Vedaic conception that MERX thinks of so much importance. See INT. THEISM, p 15, 16. Why may not such a myth be regarded as having crossed the Indus, if it was there at that early period, or as having arisen from the imagination of the dwellers in Zophar's native land of *Naama,* נַעֲמָה (the *land of delights*), wherever that may have been. Such a fancied Paradise of sense would be immeasurably inferior to the scriptural idea of the ζωῆς αἰωνίου, far inferior, we might say, to Job's vision of a reconciled God, with no other accompaniments. Wholly without God, as they are, it might be maintained, that such mythical representations, with all their "sweetness and light," have really less moral value than the shadows of Sheol which Job so mournfully depicts, and the bare hope of hearing, at some time, God's voice of deliverance from it (xiv. 15). Whatever may be thought of such a conjecture, the resemblance the passage bears to the Koranic language is certainly very striking. The latter may have been derived from it. Such is the opinion of Good, a commentator from whom much may be learned, notwithstanding his work is so marred by extravagant conceits and arbitrary changes of the Hebrew text. See Excursus I. of the Addenda.

[15] Ver. 18. **Toil (wronged).** יָגָע, like יְגִיעַ, denotes primarily *labor,* and then the *fruit of labor,* whether as coming to the laborer or to his employer. There being no personal suffix, it must be taken generally as the toil, the wages of the wronged toiler, and therefore the word in brackets is simply the complement of the intended idea. The second clause has occasioned some difficulty. חֵיל is certainly construct (*wealth of exchange*), and therefore the rendering of E. V. cannot be sustained, or that of UMBREIT, who would arbitrarily regard it as absolute. The construction, however, may be explained in two ways: 1. By regarding the second ו as connecting the clause with מֵשִׁיב; the first ו making a subordinate connection reading thus: '*Restores the fruit of toil, and does not swallow it as the wealth of his exchange, and does not enjoy it.*' This makes the two clauses so closely inter-dependent as to form one in fact—a construction which is not according to the usual style of the parallels in Job. 2. The second clause may be taken by itself, and thus rendered: *It is as wealth of his exchange, and he does not enjoy.* This is, indeed, very awkward English; but it gives the idea. The ו may possibly be taken as connecting by way of comparison, which is not unfrequently the case, especially in Proverbs; but a truer view is to regard it as connecting directly תְּמוּרָתוֹ and יַעֲלֹס, a verb and a *verbal* noun. Taking both as verbs, it would be: *Wealth that he exchanges and does not enjoy;* or taking both as nouns: *Wealth of exchange, and not of enjoyment.* "Wealth of restitution," SCHLOTTMAN well renders it. Better still would be: *wealth of retribution;* and so it might have been given in our Metrical Version:

As wealth of retribution, not of joy;

but it was thought best to keep the word *exchange* as not only more concise, but more distinctly preserving the figure.

[16] Ver. 19. **Because.** The force of כִּי here, and as repeated in ver. 20, seems to extend to the strong apodotic expression עַל כֵּן, in the second clause of ver. 21. Such a carrying of the protasis through several parallel verses, has other examples in Job. See xv. 25–29, where commentators (EWALD, DILLMANN, ZÖCKLER, *et al.*) continue the protasis, through four verses (*weil—weil—weil—deshalb*). כִּי is used there in the same way, and is rendered because (*because—because, etc.—therefore*) although the connection is less clear, and there is no apodotic particle like עַל כֵּן (see note on the passage). Here translators generally break it up, or find subordinate apodoses, at the end, or in the middle of intervening clauses, although the demand for continuance is much more clear than in the other passage, and the strong עַל כֵּן at end seems not to be satisfied with anything less. Thus the כִּי in ver. 19 covers its second clause. The repetition of it in the 20th has not only the same effect, but goes over into the first clause of ver. 21, making the great conclusion with עַל כֵּן all the more emphatic. The 21st verse, it is true, begins with אֵין, which is an asserting particle, but that does not make it independent, or to be taken alone as the protasis to the following. The leaving out the copulative particles, and the omission of כִּי at the beginning of ver. 21 only makes it more forcible as the language of passion and impetuosity according to the rule of Aristotle, which

Seized[17] ruthlessly a house he would not build;
20 Because content, within, he never knew,
Nor lets[18] escape him aught of his desire—
21 (No, not a shred for his devouring greed),—
Therefore it is, his GOOD[19] cannot endure.
22 In the fullness of his wealth, his straits begin;
When every hand of toil[20] against him comes.
23 Be[21] it the time to fill his greed;
'Tis then God sends on him His burning storm of wrath,
Until He rains it on him in his food.
24 Does he flee from the iron lance?[22]
The bow of brass shall pierce him through and through.
25 HE[23] hath drawn [the sword]; forth comes it from his flesh;
The gleaming weapon from his gall.
He is gone.[24] Terrors are over him.

must hold true in all languages, that when the sense is clear without them, conjunctions had better be dispensed with. The transiator has endeavored to preserve this asyndetic styie, and, at the same time, to carry into the English the conciseness of the Hebrew.

[17] Ver. 19. **Seized ruthlessly.** The rendering *plunder* misleads. It conveys the idea of robbing or despoiling a house of things that are in it. The more common as well as the primary sense of גזל is here demanded, not only because it alone is applicable to a house, but because it gives the contrast wanted between the two ideas of violently taking possession, and of building for one's-self. The future (יבנהו) expresses not only that which objectively follows *in time*, but also what is subjectively consecutive, that is, in the order of the thought. In Greek and Latin the future is the mother of the subjective moods. In Hebrew, which is so destitute of modal forms, it is used for them. *Had built*, or *builded not*, as E. V. renders it after the Vulgate, wili not do, because it makes a pluperfect or an objectively finished past prior in the order of the thought.

[18] Ver. 20. **Nor lets escape.** ימלט may be regarded, like many other examples of Piel and Hiphil verbs, as *permissive* or *preventive*, as well as *causal—let escape—make escape.* Its future form is because it is consecutive in idea to the previous clause: He is so unquiet or unsatisfied that he *lets not*, or *will not let*,—the rendering in English by the future, or the present, coming to the same thing.

[19] Ver. 21. **His good.** Some such word as *prosperity for* טוב might seem more emphatic; but the simpler English word includes it and more. There is intended his *summum bonum*, or what seems such to the bad man. *Therefore his* GOOD *shall not endure.* It sounds like a sentence of judgment, after the arraignment in the previous items. If it is not too cruel a supposition, we may regard the angry yet eloquent Zophar as having Job in view, as though, at every item, he pointed to him as he sat in the ashes, intimating that he is the man: It must be that he had done some most wicked and oppressive acts,*—crushed the poor—seized a house—gratified himself* in everything; and therefore it is that his property and his happiness are all gone.

[20] Ver. 22. **Every hand of toil.** DELITZSCH: "The rich uncompassionate man becomes the defenceless prey of the proletaires."

[21] Ver. 23. **Be it the time**—taken as a supposition. The simplest rendering here is the surest. מלאות, above, suggests the מלא in this verse, and there must be a similarity of statement and idea. At the very time when his greed is highest, and he is about to satisfy it, then God sends, *etc.* This makes the 3d clause unmistakable, though it seems to have perplexed commentators. The rain of wrath mingles with the food he is eating, just as in other places tears mingle with the bread one is eating. See Ps. lxxx. 6; xlii. 4. The other rendering makes *the filling of his belly* in the first clause, God's filling his belly with *wrath* (by way of irony for *food*) and then in the third clause, לחום is made the object of the verb: *He rains his food upon him*,—to the neglect of the preposition ב, or disposing of it in the facile way of calling it *Beth essentiæ.* UMBREIT renders it "*for* his meat," or in place of it. So DILLMANN. That is a sense of ב in some cases, but the more usual meaning is better here. DELITZSCH renders it: *rain upon him into his flesh*, giving two indirect objects to ימטר, but no direct one. He takes for לחום a sense it seems to have, Zeph. i. 17, and which he derives from the Arabic לחם; quite a different word with very different vowels. Besides this, it is not easy to give ב the sense of *into* after a verb of motion with the idea of attack, especially such a verb as ימטר. The rendering flesh, says DILLMANN, is wholly inadmissible.

[22] Ver. 24. **Iron lance.** נשק, *armor*, generally, but here some striking or piercing weapon. **Through and through:** The rendering is not too strong for that most peculiar and emphatic word תחלפהו.

[23] Ver. 25. **He hath drawn.** The translator agrees with UMBREIT in regarding God as the subject of שלף. The Divine name thus left out makes it all the more fearful as well as emphatic. It might be rendered passively *it is drawn —unsheathed*—but there is no need of it. Suddenness is the idea the words vividly impress. It is no sooner out of its scabbard than it is through his body; or, between its being drawn from the sheath and being drawn back from his gall is but a moment. The other rendering: *he* (*the one pierced*) *draws it out*, or back, ioses all this, besides having very serious philological difficulties. It must, in that case, refer to the arrow just above, but the verb is ever used of the sword in the numerous places of its occurrence, except in Ruth iv. 7, 8, where it means *slipping* the foot out of the shoe or sandal, and Ps. cxxix. 6, where it is the *slipping* of the flower out of its calix, or of the fruit from its glume or husk (*entschlofen*; see HUPFELD). When used of a weapon it is *always* the sword, and its drawing is from its sheath. Jud. iii. 22 is oniy a seeming exception, as there the body is regarded as the sheath, and it is the sword still; no other weapon being carried in a sheath. The word שלף (S. L. P.) is *onomatopic*, like our word *slip*—not that the one is derived from the other, but that both are formed on the same principle as signifying an easy slipping motion. The rendering of DELITZSCH and others, makes, moreover, a feeble tautoiogy: "*he draws it out; and it comes out.*" Another reason given by UMBREIT has much force: ברק *fulgur, brightness*, is generally used of the sword when applied to a weapon; Deut. xxxii. 41; Ezek. xxi. 15, 20; or sometimes of the spear, he might have said. The barb of the arrow, moreover, would prevent its being *easily* drawn back by the *victim*, and *tearing*, as DELITZSCH renders, would be greatly out of congruity with the verb שלף. On נוה see Note (7) chap. xxxv. 5.

[24] Ver. 25. **He is gone.** The accents separate יהלך from אמים. The latter word cannot, therefore, be the subject, even if the number permitted. The verb stands by itself. There is an appalling suddenness and abruptness in this whole description, which is best given in measures somewhat irregular. For examples of יהלך taken in a similar way, see xiv. 20; xix. 10; xxvii. 20. The rendering which

26 In his *hid*[25] treasures lies all darkness *hid*;
A self-enkindled[26] fire consumes it ever more,
Still feeding[27] on the remnant in his tent.
27 His sins the Heavens reveal;
Against him rises up the earth.
28 His wealth to other lands[28] departs,
Like flowing waters, in His day of wrath.

29 This is the bad man's portion sent from God,—
His lot appointed from the[29] Mighty One.

regards the word as separated, is sustained by ROSENMUELLER, SCHULTENS, HIRZEL, *et al.* The old versions are the other way. The usage, however, of הלך in the places mentioned, to say nothing of the accents, is decidedly against the translation of the VULGATE, *etc.*

[25] Ver. 26. **Hid treasures** טמון—צפניו. The two words have both of them the idea of *hiding*, and there seems to be something of a sententious play upon them.

[26] Ver. 26. **Self-enkindled**; *not blown upon.*

[27] Ver. 26. **Still feeding.** EWALD, ZÖCK., ROSENM., UMBREIT, make ירע from רעע: *Uebel geht es dem.* The other sense is according to the accents and the metaphor of *fire feeding* (*ignis depascens*) which is in so many languages.

[28] Ver. 28. **To other lands departs:** יִגֶל—*goes into exile.*

[29] Ver. 29. **The Mighty One.** This is CONANT's judicious rendering of the divine name אֵל to avoid a tautology.

CHAPTER XXI.

1 Then Job answered and said:

2 O listen[1] to my words;
And let that be in place of your consolings.
3 Bear with me, let me speak;
And after I have spoken, then mock on.
4 Ah me! Is my appeal to man?
Impatient then might be my soul; why not?
5 Turn now,[2] behold me—stand amazed,
And lay your hand upon your mouth:
6 'Tis when I think, that I am sore dismayed;
And trembling taketh hold on all my flesh.
7 Why do the wicked live at[3] all?
Why grow they old, yea giant[4] like in power?
8 Before them—with them—firmly stands their seed;[5]
Their spreading offspring ever in their sight.
9 Why are their houses peace, away from fear,—
No scourge upon them from Eloah's hand?

[1] Ver. 2. **O listen.** The doubling of the verb here denotes not so much a desire for *attentive* hearing, as to be heard at all. It might be expressed by an emphatic auxiliary *do: Do listen, etc.*

[2] Ver. 5. **Turn now.** פְּנוּ has the sense of turning and looking in the face. On leaving out the mere copulative in such cases, see Note xiii. 23.

[3] Ver. 7. **Live at all.** There is an emphasis on יחי. The astonishment is at God's suffering them to remain on earth, or even to be born. He goes to the root of the great problem of evil. This was the thought that so dismayed him whenever he called it to mind.

4 Ver. 7. **Giant-like.** Something of this kind demanded by the strong word גבר: *Heroes.* See Gen. vi. 4.

[5] Ver. 8. **Their seed.** Instead of description intended to be universal and dogmatic, it is clear that Job is simply touched by the contrast between his own state, bereaved of children, stripped of property, suffering acutest pain, with the condition of many a bad man in directly opposite circumstances. The points he makes show this, and it may be in perfect harmony with what follows in ver. 17, where his thoughts tend to take the other and the larger view. See ADDENDA, p.

10 The issue of their herds is sure;[6]
Their kine bring forth without mischance.
11 Their little ones, like flocks, they send them out;
Their sons and daughters[7] mingle in the dance.
12 To harp and timbrel do they raise their voice;
In melodies of flutes they take delight.
13 In joy unbroken[8] do they spend their days;
And in a moment[9] to the grave go down.
14 To God they say, Depart from us;
No knowledge of *Thy* ways do we desire.
15 The Almighty! who is he that we should serve him?
And if we pray to him, what do we gain?

[PAUSE.]

16 But lo,[10]—their good is not in their own hand.
The counsel of the wicked, be it far from me.

[A LONGER SILENCE.]

17 [Yet, truth[11] ye say]; how oft goes out the lamp of evil men!
And comes upon them their calamity!
When God, in wrath, allots them deadly[12] pangs.
18 Like stubble are they then before the wind,—
Like chaff the whirling tempest bears away.
19 Eloah treasures up his evil for his sons;[13]
To *him* He thus repays it—*he* shall know.
20 His own destruction shall *his* eyes behold;
When from the wrath of Shaddai he shall drink.
21 For what his pleasure[14] in posterity,
When sundered thus the number of his months?

[PAUSE.]

[6] Ver. 10. **The issue of their herds.** In this clear passage, euphemistic language may be allowed.

[7] Ver. 10. **Sons and daughters.** ילדיהם is in contrast with עוילים rendered *little* ones. It may be taken for the grown-up children of both sexes.

[8] Ver. 13. **In joy unbroken.** Heb. בטוב, *in good.* But this is to be taken here for what the wicked man esteems *the good*, his *summum bonum*,—pleasure or enjoyment uninterrupted and without stint.

[9] Ver. 13. **In a moment.** A quick death is spoken of as the good fortune of the wicked. "*There are no bands in their death*," Ps. lxxiii. 4. רֶגַע an instant of time; רָגֵעַ *quiet;* there would seem to be here intended something of both ideas. שאול here is rendered the grave. It has a further sense, the *spirit* world, or the under-world. It is, however, best rendered here according to the bad man's conception.

[10] Ver. 16. **But lo.** For a discussion in respect to the remarkable transition here, and in the verse following. See EXCURSUS, ADDENDA, pa. 175

[11] Ver. 17. (**Yet truth ye say**). For the propriety of the words in brackets, and of the interpretation generally, see ADDENDA, pa. 175

[12] Ver. 17. **Deadly pangs.** חֲבָלִים, *tortures*, primary sense, *to bind.*

[13] Ver. 19. **Eloah treasures.** There is no warrant for taking this as a question; still less as an ironical taunt on the part of Job, as though making it the language of the friends and then deriding it. Equally defenceless is it, the making יְשַׁלֵּם imprecatory here, and thus to differ from all the other futures before and after it. See EXCURS. II. on this chapter; ADDENDA, p. 182. The retribution on his sons is, in fact, retribution on himself, and, in some way, he shall know it to be so. It may be, too, that אוֹנוֹ may have, in this verse, its other clear and frequent sense of strength and wealth.

[14] Ver. 21. **For what his pleasure.** What *concern*, others render it. A turn may be given to this which may make it seem to favor the other or imprecatory rendering of the previous verse ("*for what cares he for his house after him*"); but the other changes which this is made to suit are so forced as to invalidate the opposite reasoning, however plausible, in respect to this verse. A connection of thought between vers. 20 and 21 is easily seen without it. A sudden destruction is predicted, ver. 20, when his wealth goes to others, and what pleasure will he have of it? This suddenness is intimated in חֻצָּץ which means sharp cutting, *cutting off* in the very midst of his enjoyments,—not a calm old age and easy death closing all cares, which is demanded by the other view. The thought of judicial severity is inseparable from חֻצָּץ thus used.

22 [Ah, how is this?][15] Shall any man teach[16] God?
Teach Him who judgeth things on high!
23 (For see); one dieth in his perfect strength,
All quiet[17] and at ease.
24 His breasts[18] are full of milk;
And moist the marrow of his bones.
25 Another dies in bitterness of soul,
And never tastes of good.
26 Alike in dust do both lie down;
Alike o'er both the worm its covering spreads.

[PAUSE.]

27 Behold I know your thoughts,—
Thoughts[19] to my hurt, ye wrongfully[20] maintain.
28 For where's the dwelling of the Prince, say ye,[21]—
And where the tent of evil men's abode?
29 Have ye not asked the passers by the way?
And know ye not their[22] signs?
30 That to the day of doom the wicked man is[23] kept;
To the day of mighty[24] wrath are they brought forth.
31 Yet who before his face declares[25] his way?
And who requites him (here) what he hath done?
32 Still to the grave (like others) is he brought;
And for him, o'er his tomb, one keepeth[26] watch.
33 On him, too, lightly[27] press the valley clods;

15 Ver. 22. **Ah, how is this?** A pause here, with an intervening thought, leading to what follows, may be rationally supposed. See ADDENDA, pa. 176. The words in brackets denote the transition. It is a very impassioned speech. Job's mind is *revolving* like that of Koheleth, when he so often says "I turned"—"I turned again to see"—I took another and another view of things, *etc.* The chief difference is that Koheleth is in a more calm and contemplative state, and gives outward notice of these mental changes, whilst Job silently broods over them, and then bursts forth. His state of soul, instead of being a meditative rest, is tumultuous, volcanic we might almost style it, as it sometimes shows itself. To expect of him closely connected and logical sequences, is itself most illogical. The statements in previous verses, apparently varying, but, in fact, only two parts of one picture viewed from different stand-points, naturally bring up the thought of the great diversity in the lives and deaths of men,—a fact inexplicable on any human theory. This again calls up the thought of some higher wisdom of God yet unknown to men. It is fully set forth in ch. xxviii., but Job is only approaching it here. It produces the silence of a moment, when he resumes: *shall one teach God?* and then goes on with the picture of diversity in human condition that had led to it.

16 Ver. 22. **Teach God**—see note below on ver. 30, and the pages in the ADDENDA there referred to.

17 Ver. 23. **All quiet.** Heb. שַׁלְאֲנָן. GESENIUS regards this strange form as a compound of שלה and שאנן. BEN GANACH, in his Hebrew Grammar entitled SEPHER HA RIKMA, page 18, maintains that it is only שאנן with an euphonic ל giving it a more intensive sense.

18 Ver. 24. **His breasts** עֲטִין occurs but once. Some give it the sense of *station for watering flocks* (as derived from the Arabic) and then transferred to the flocks themselves. The parallelism, however, demands a word denoting some part of the body to correspond to *bones* in the second clause. There seems to be nothing better, after all, than the rendering *breasts* which E. V. got from the Targum, and which, as an expression of health, may be applicable to either sex.

19 Ver. 27. **Thoughts to my hurt.** מחשבות means thoughts generally, מְזִמּוֹת, especially with עלי, means evil thoughts. From the rendering of E. V., and that of most of the commentators, there would be derived the idea of plots or machinations (*stratagems* DELITZSCH renders it) or of something to be done to, or against, Job. But the words do not really demand this. מזמות may refer simply to the false and unfavorable views they have indulged of Job's case and character.

20 Ver. 27. **Wrongfully.** חמס has generally the associated thought of *violence*, but the essential idea is that of *injustice.* It seems to combine the two senses very much as the Greek ὕβρις—ὑβρίζω.

21 Ver. 28. **Say ye.** Equivalent to *think ye*, as φημὶ in Greek sometimes.

22 Ver. 29. **Their signs;** like mottoes borne on their standards—enigmatical devices,—or, taken generally, any modes by which their sententious or traditional language is made known.

23 Ver. 30. **To the day of doom the wicked man is kept.** On the general interpretation of this verse, see EXCURSUS III. of the ADDENDA, pa. 182.

24 Ver. 30. **Mighty wrath.** Literally *to the day of wraths, dies irarum.* The word עֲבָרוֹת is the intensive plural.

25 Ver. 30. **Declares his way.** Who dares tell him of the fearful איד to which his way leads, or of the *day of wrath* to which he is *to be brought forth.* Nothing could be more appropriate to the view taken of ver. 30 in E. V., and insisted on in EXCURSUS III. If ver. 30 refers to some great eschatological doom, however dimly conceived as belonging to some unknown period, then the word *here*, as placed in brackets, is implied in the emphasis of the passage.

26 Ver. 32. **One keepeth watch.** Various views are taken of this; but no one seems more simple and natural than the idea of a friend or relative keeping watch by the grave, whether as guardian or as mourner. The wicked man, too, has those who loved him in spite of his wickedness. The picture is a very touching one.

27 Ver. 33. **Lightly press.** The Hebrew מתקו literally means *are sweet*, but may be applied to anything agreeable, or represented as such, whether in fancy or reality. Compare xxiv. 20: *The worm feeds sweetly on him*, or, *his sweetness is the worm.* The idea, in either case, is that of insensibility to suffering, but strangely conceived of as having something of enjoyment. We do not wholly divest ourselves

And after him come all in lengthened[28] train,
As countless numbers thus have gone before.[29]

[CONCLUSION.]

34 How then console ye me? 'Tis empty breath,[30]
Since in your answers still remains offence.[31]

of such feelings when we talk of the grave as a place of rest. The clods of the valley resting upon him give no pain, and are, therefore, conceived of as pleasant. The expression here suggests the classical, *levis sit terra*. See Euripides Alcestis, 470:

——— Κούφα σοι
Χθὼν ἐπάνω πεσειε—γύναι.

Light fall the earth upon thee—lady.

[28] Ver. 33. **Lengthened train.** An idea clearly contained in the Hebrew ימשון. See Jud. iv. 6, 7, where it denotes the drawing out of the military line; Ps. xxviii. 3: "*Draw me not out* (*or let me not draw out*) with the wicked."

[29] Ver. 33. **Have gone before.** Life a procession; one part coming, another passing, another gone. It reminds us of the monumental lines from the Greek Anthology:

———τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδόν
ἣν πάντας ἐλθεῖν ἔστ' ἀναγκαίως ἔχον,
προεληλύθασιν——

On the road that all must travel have they gone,
A little way before.

All alike; even God's Elect present the same appearance of an ever-passing and disappearing procession:

Part of the host have crossed the flood,
And part are crossing now.

The picture presented by Job is as touching as it is true and universal. The great distinguishing day of doom kept out of sight, the same sad destiny seems to await all mankind. All are marching to the tomb, and seem to lie down in it as their common place of rest. On this verse UMBREIT makes some of his characteristic remarks: Ein bitterer Ausspruch! He calls it: "*a bitter or rancorous judgment*. Is the wicked man extirpated from the earth by death, so follow him others without number," *etc.* (pa. 171). He would represent Job, in saying this, as governed by a spirit of morose misanthropy. On the contrary, the language of this and the preceding verse may be cited as evidence of what the translator has elsewhere insisted on (see ADDENDA, pa. 175), namely, the striking difference between the speeches of Job and those of the others. Impassioned, as his language is, in view of his own severe sufferings, there is, after all, the manifestation of a softer feeling when his revolving thoughts lead him to consider the common lot of humanity. In his second picture of the wicked man's wretchedness, or his afterthought, as we may call it, he alludes to their doom in some great judgment, all unknown and undetermined though it be; and that seems immediately to call up a tenderer language which looks very much like commiseration for the wicked man himself. He, too, lies down in the dust, like all other men. He, too, has some one who loves him, and who will watch mournfully by his grave. On him, too, will "lightly press the clods of the valley," as upon the most lovely and innocent among "the dwellers in dust." How different are these tender images from the fierce speech of Zophar, especially as it appears in the terrible pictures with which he concludes, xx. 23–27: "The gleaming weapon piercing through his gall," and his very food mingled with "the Almighty's rain of burning wrath." That is the language of one who seems to love such picturing, and actually to exult in the sinner's doom. He assumes towards Job the attribute of moral superiority; and, good man as he is, he cannot conceal the self-righteous feeling with which he so formally passes sentence at the close:

This is the bad man's portion sent from God—
His lot appointed from the Mighty One.

There is more severity in Job's picture, xxvii. 13–23; but here there certainly seems to be an effusion of tenderness not to be found in the speeches of the others. They are cool, philosophical moralists, except when roused to indignation by Job's refusal to confess. He is the true hero, the mighty wrestler with sin and suffering. His moral sense goes deeper than theirs. He is more conscious of his own sin, of the common depravity, and, therefore, the more likely to lose sight of outward moral differences in the contemplation of the universal suffering. Job comes nearer than they to the spirit of Christ and to the spirit of His language when He says: "Think ye that they were sinners above all the Galileans? I tell you nay; but unless ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish."

[30] Ver. 34. **Empty breath.** E. V. *in vain.* There is but the Hebrew word הֶבֶל, or הֲבֵל, *vapor*, *lenis aura*, *ἀτμός* —so often used by Koheleth, though with a slightly differing form, הֲבֵל הֲבָלִים, "*vanity of vanities.*" Here it denotes *worthlessness*; but the primary sense of words should be preserved in a translation, if possible, and especially if they are very significant.

[31] Ver. 34. **Offence.** מַעַל; *perverse action or thought against any one.* Hence wrongful treatment consisting in continually taking a *false* view of Job's case, rather than *actual falsehood* in speech, or in abstract opinion.

CHAPTER XXII.

1 Then answered Eliphaz the Temanite and said:

2 The strong[1] man—can he profit God,
That thereby[2] he may wisely serve himself?
3 Is Shaddai, then, concerned that thou art just,
Or is it gain to Him that thou make pure thy way?

[1] Ver. 2. **The strong man.** גֶּבֶר as used in Job is generally emphatic—the strong, powerful, or rich man as distinguished from the common man, or man in general. Here Eliphaz would apply it peculiarly to Job as one who may have thought he was doing God service when he was serving himself, as Satan also charged, i. 9.

[2] Ver. 2. **That thereby.** Some take this parenthetically; as DELITZSCH: "No indeed! the intelligent man is profitable to himself." So RENAN: Non; c'est à lui seul que le sage est utile. It is not easy to see what warrant there is for it grammatically, or what demand of the sense makes it necessary. The picture suggested is that of a man who thinks he is serving God, profiting God, when his aim is thereby to profit himself, and who makes a great outcry when stripped, as he fancies, of these his gains. The connection and dependence of the כִּי gives the easy and appropriate sense in harmony with all that Eliphaz says afterwards. מַשְׂכִּיל, *the prudent man.* There seems to be just a touch of irony here: Prudent man as he is in such a calculation of the accruing advantages of outward piety. It may be well rendered adverbially: *wisely serve himself.*

4 For thy religion's[3] sake, will He reprove,
Or go with thee to judgment's reckoning?
5 May it not be,[4] thy evil, too, is great?
Thy sins beyond thy numbering?
6 May it not be[5] that thou for nought hast held thy brother's pledge?
Or from the naked stripped their covering?
7 Or failed to give the weary drink,
Or from the hungry hast withheld thy bread?
8 [Hast said][6] the land is for the strong;
The honorable man, he dwells therein;
9 Yea widows empty hast thou sent away,—
The arm hast broken of the fatherless.
10 Wherefore, it may be,[7] snares are round thee spread;
And sudden fear alarms;
11 Or darkness, that thou can'st not[8] see,
Or water floods that overwhelm thy[9] soul.

12 Lo![10] where Eloah dwells! the heaven sublime![11]
Behold! the crown[12] of stars! how high they are!
13 "How doth God know?" 'Tis that thy thought is[13] saying:

[3] Ver. 4. **For thy religion's sake.** E. V. *for fear of thee.* So Umbreit, "aus Furcht vor dir;" Rosenmueller, *et al.*, *out of respect*, reverence, aus Ehrfurcht, which Umbreit condemns. Delitzsch rightly takes יִרְאָה here subjectively —thy fear of God—thy professed religion. as in iv. 6; xv. 4.

[4] Ver. 5. **May it not be?** See Excursus IV., Addenda, pa. 185.

[5] Ver. 6. **May it not be?** See Exc. IV., pa. 185.

[6] Ver. 8. (**Hast said**). On these words in brackets, and their propriety as an essential part of a clear translation, see Exc. IV. p. 185; also remarks of Rabbi Tanchum there cited, on a similar case, Lam. iii. 36.

[7] Ver. 10. **Wherefore, it may be.** See Excursus IV., Addenda, p. 185. The passage treated as conjectural, or hypothetical, from ver. 5 to ver. 10.

[8] Ver. 10. **Canst not see.** This refers probably to Job's supposed mental state, as one incapable, according to Eliphaz, of discovering his true moral condition.

[9] Ver. 11. **Thy soul;** The translation full here, but in the very spirit of the Hebrew which uses נַפְשְׁךָ, *thy soul*, for the personal pronoun.

[10] Ver. 12. **Lo!** הֲלֹא, here has evidently the force of an interjection calling attention, and is equivalent to הִנֵּה. It is one of the clearest of the many cases specified by Noldius where it has the sense of *ecce*. See Gen. xiii. 9; Deut. xi. 30; 1 Kings xv. 23, and scores of other places. It is in such cases rendered הָא by the Syriac (*Lo! behold!*) as it gives it in this very place. The LXX. in such cases have ἰδοὺ, and the Vulgate *ecce*. In the Hebrew itself, in passages precisely parallel in Kings and Chronicles (see examples in Noldius) הֲלֹא and הִנֵּה are interchanged. So also in the Targum renderings. Its interjectional force appears here by its being put in parallelism with רְאֵה *behold* (ἰδού) in the second clause. It is, moreover, the language of emotion here (of admiration) and therefore exclamatory and broken; literally: *Lo Eloah! height of Heaven!* as in xi. 8, גָּבְהֵי שָׁמַיִם, *heights of Heaven!* or *O, immeasurable height!*

[11] Ver. 12. **Heaven sublime.** גֹּבַהּ (**Gaboah**) is in Hebrew the emotional word for height in distinction from the more prosaic terms, and therefore the rendering *sublime* is chosen, not only to avoid a tautology in English, but as most expressive of the emotional. This appears from its other sense of *glory*. It is *height* with *wonder* (ὕψος). It is strictly a construct noun without any words of assertion, or of place: *Ecce, Eloah! Sublimitas Cœlorum!* We must supply connective words.

[12] Ver. 12. **Behold the crown of stars.** Literally **the head** of the stars (רֹאשׁ). Rendered in various ways: Delitzsch, *head;* so Umbreit and others; Conant, *summit;* Renan, *le front des etoiles. The crown* seemed preferable, as denoting some brilliant star or constellations, nearly overhead, as those three brilliant constellations, the Swan, the Eagle and the Harp, with each a star of the first magnitude, appear almost directly overhead in the early part of the autumnal nights. It was first thought of rendering ראש, the *zenith*, or the *pole*, but the first would be too astronomical, and the latter would be incorrect, for the pole star or stars are not overhead, and would not be selected for their altitude. It is a night scene,—a real scene. They are looking up to the very vertex of the heavens, at the constellations shining down upon them from the immeasurable spaces above. Nothing gives such a *conception* of altitude, when it is regarded as something emotional in distinction from the mere frigid mathematical estimate of abstract number. How very high they are! It is as when we read the old account of the Flood; not simply that the waters rose fifteen cubits, or more, over certain measurements. That may have come from tradition, or in some other way. There is little or no emotion in it. But when the writer says the waters rose, *up—up*,—מאד—מאד—*higher—higher*—we feel that it is a spectator who is describing the scene, or that it is all a designed and artful deception. So here; this emotional language: Lo! Eloah! sublimity of heaven! See! the crown of stars! how very high they are! *ὅσον ὕψος!* The rapt simplicity of the language, its broken, wondering utterances all show that if it is a painting, it is a painting from the life, the vivid representation of a real scene in which the emotion overpowers and checks the language. It is a silent, *heartfelt*, admiration, like that of the Shepherd in Homer's exquisite night scene, Iliad viii. 559—

πάντα δέ τ' εἴδεται ἄστρα· γέγηθε δέ τε φρένα ποιμήν—

"When all the stars appear, and the Shepherd rejoices *in his soul.*"

[13] Ver. 13. **'Tis that thy thought is saying.** But when had Job said this, or anything like it? It would not be easy to point it out, unless in some way, the language, ix. 8, could be tortured into some fashion of such a meaning namely, that God could not see because He was so high, and could not look through the cloud. Eliphaz, however, seems to pride himself upon the greatness of the other view which he assumes to take, namely, that the higher God is, the more keenly does He see every thing below Him. Compare Ps. cxiii. 5, 6, where God is said to be so high that "He stoops down to see the things even in the heavens,"—the lower heavens—as well as things on earth. Delitzsch renders אמרת *thou thinkest*, or *thoughtest* for which there is the authority of Greek verbs of speaking, and in the same way for *thinking* or *speaking to one's self*. But Job no more *thought* this than *said* it. He could form as high notions of God's space altitude, as Eliphaz, and he never had the crude notion that God could not see from behind the cloud; but space altitude,

"Behind the dark araphel[14] can He judge?
14 Clouds are a covering, that He cannot see;
All by Himself[15] on heaven's high dome He walks."

15 Ah! wilt thou call to mind[16] that way of old,
Which evil men once trod;
16 They who were withered[17] up before their time,—
Their strong foundations melted[18] like a flood,—
17 The men who said to God, "depart from us,
For what can Shaddai do to them[19]?"
18 When He it was who filled their house with good,
That way of evil men, O be it far[20] from me.
19 The righteous see it and rejoice;
The guiltless make a byword[21] of their doom:
20 "Now is our enemy destroyed" (they say);
"And their abundance hath the fire devoured."

21 O now make friends[22] with Him, and be at peace;
For, in so doing, good[23] shall come to thee.
22 Receive instruction[24] from His mouth;
And treasure up His words within thy heart.
23 To Shaddai turn;[25] then shalt thou be restored,
When from thy tent thou hast put far the wrong.
24 Then shalt thou lay[26] up gold as dust,—
Yea Ophir gold like pebbles of the stream.

or space *distance*, was but little to him compared with that other idea of the Divine *nearness* to his soul, which he had somehow lost, and for which he so intensely mourned. We see this in the next chapter, and some of his language there about "not finding God on the right or on the left," may have been suggested by these very words by which Eliphaz sought to overwhelm him. It mattered little to him how high He might be above the stars. It was a present God for whom he longed, when he said, "O that I knew where I might find Him." Without the feeling of His near grace, the theistic idea, with its highest space conceptions, had as little moral value as the modern scientific deity, so far off in time, and who has done nothing since the first projection of "the nebular fluid" in empty space.

[14] Ver. 13. **The dark araphel.** It was thought best to keep in the translation this grand sounding, and most significant Hebrew word. It denotes the *nimbus*, the black thunder cloud—*caligo nubium.*

[15] Ver. 14. **All by himself he walks.** DELITZSCH: *He walketh at His pleasure* יתהלך. The Hithpahel keeps the personal or reflex sense, denoting a course of action. Compare it as applied to man, Ps. xxxix. 7. Eliphaz seems to ascribe to Job the idea which Lucretius gives us of the gods as living by themselves, *extra mundum*, and taking no part in human affairs. See Luc. I. 57.

[16] Ver. 15. **Call to mind.** תשמור, rendered *observe, keep, etc.* So CONANT and DELITZSCH. The other sense, *to watch, to take note of,* Ps. xvii. 4, seems better adapted to the warning style of Eliphaz.

[17] Ver. 16. **Withered up.** See note ch. xvi. 18.

[18] Ver. 16. **Melted.** יצק is used of metals melted, dissolved, and thus poured forth, not of water generally. The rendering above given is not only truer, but more expressive. The reference would seem to be not to the flood, but to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, *fused* or melted by the volcanic lightning. This is confirmed, ver. 20, in the mockery or by-word of the righteous: "*Their* abundance hath the fire consumed." The overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah became a by-word in the Hebrew, as in the phrase, "*the overturning of Sodom and Gomorrah,*" so often repeated by the Prophets. The same language passed into the Koran. See Note Genesis (Lange), pp. 442, 443.

[19] Ver. 17. **To them.** One of the sudden changes of person so common in the Poetical Hebrew.

[20] Ver. 18. **That way of evil men.** The second clause is a repetition of Job's language, xxi. 16. Eliphaz perhaps means to show that he can say this with more sincerity than Job.

[21] Ver. 19. **By-word.** לעג here can hardly have the meaning of sport or derision, though that is its usual sense. We must not, indeed, judge it by our modern more Christianized feeling; but such a rendering would be incongruous to an event represented as long past, such as this ever-memorable catastrophe of Sodom and Gomorrah. The way of speaking of it assumed the warning, but not the taunting or mocking form. See Note 18 and the reference there.

[22] Ver. 21. **Make friends.** הַסְכֶּן נָא. The Hiphil form here, we may suppose, is suggested by, and still preserves some of the sense of, the Kal., ver. 1. *Make thyself truly profitable—serve Him truly,* and not with a view to thy own profit, as is intimated, according to our rendering, in the second clause of ver. 1. UMBREIT well gives it: Zeig dich als treuen Diener ihm.

[23] Ver. 21. **Good shall come to thee.** The term good—the divine blessing, as some render. When a man serves God without thinking of his own profit in so doing, then will he be truly profited. It confirms the view the translator has taken of the second clause of ver. 1.

[24] Ver. 22. **Instruction.** תורה. The absence of the article and the general style of the exhortation show that it is *precept* or *instruction* generally, and not the Mosaic law, or any fixed code, that is intended.

[25] Ver. 23. **To Shaddai turn.** The exhortation here is also in the words of Zophar, xi. 14, "*let not wrong abide,*" *etc.*

[26] Ver. 24. **Lay up gold.** The translator is satisfied that our E. V. is right here, though so many commentators vary from it, even so far as almost to reverse the thought. As CONANT, whose version is clearest and best expresses the sense of them all:

> *Cast* to the dust the precious ore,
> And the gold of Ophir to the stones of the brooks.

That is, reject it: count it as dross—of no value. There are some very strong objections to this: 1. Such a contempt

25 Then, too, shall Shaddai be thy precious[27] ore,
Thy silver from the[28] mine.
26 Then in th' Omnipotent shall be thy joy;
Yes, to Eloah shalt thou lift thy face.
27 Then shalt thou pray to Him, and He will hear,
And offerings thou hast vowed thou shalt perform.
28 The thing decreed by thee shall firmly stand;
And over all thy ways the light shall shine.
29 When men look down, then shalt thou say—"aloft![29]
[Look up], the meek-eyed will HE raise."
30 Yes, even the[30] guilty HE shall save;
By the pureness of thy hands shall they escape.

of wealth is not after the Old Testament style of speaking. Abraham is commended for his wealth; his great possessions are reckoned up as being a part of his own value. So is it with Job at the commencement and at the end. Sheep and camels are as much dross as the gold with which they are bought. 2. The translation objected to makes a jar in the general movement of the passage. There is nothing in its structure demanding a parenthesis, and the other view, which regards the gold and the silver as a blessing, is but an enlarged specification of the promise, *good shall come to thee*, ver. 21. It is, too, a part of the restoration or *building up* promised ver. 23, and so remarkably verified in the end of the book. 3. Job had, at that time, no gold of Ophir, or wealth of any kind, to cast away, and such advice to him in Eliphaz would seem to be a mockery, whilst making it *the love of gold* would be far-fetched here, even if it had any seeming warrant from the words. 4. שִׁית never means *to cast away, projicere*, a sense which Gesenius gives to accommodate it to this one place. It is a very uniform word, meaning *to put, place, etc.*, and when used in such a connection as this has almost the contrary meaning of *depositing, laying up, treasuring up, etc.* GESENIUS' reference to Ruth iii. 15 has no applicability. The easy rendering there is: "He measured the barley, and *put* it upon her," as a load. 5. In opposition to the idea of rejecting as worthless stands the evident fact, that the point of the comparison in "*dust* and *pebbles*" is not worthlessness of value or *quality*, but greatness of *quantity*. The other view (that of E. V.) is perfectly consistent with the context before and after. Eliphaz assures Job that if he *repents* (the common Arabic sense of שׁוּב=תוּב), he shall be abundantly prospered, and gold may be a part of such prosperity as well as any other kind of property. שִׁית here may be taken as an imperative with a predictive sense: but it is better to regard it as an infinitive connected with תִּבָּנֶה ver. 23: "Yes, so built up as to put gold, or lay up gold, as dust." For a passage exactly parallel to the second clause, see 2 Chron. i. 15: ix. 27; "Solomon made silver in Jerusalem as plentiful, כָּאֲבָנִים, as the stones." עַל, in the first clause, is comparative from the idea of one thing placed *by* or *right over* another, or rather with the sense of *over* or *beyond*, like מִן comparative, or the Greek παρά sometimes. In the second clause, instead of בְצוּר, KENNICOTT found כְצוּר in the more ancient editions. But it may make the same sense taken either way, as JONA BEN GANNACH (*Aboul Walid*), in his Grammar, pa. 34, gives a good many examples of what he styles בֵּית תְּמוּרָה, the *beth of exchange*, that is, of *substitution* or *comparison*—one thing *in the place* of another, and so performing the office of כְּ. See the late Frankfort edition (Hebrew) of the *Sepher Ha Rikma*, pa. 34. What follows, ver. 25: *The Almighty shall be thy treasure*, is in harmony with this, and even made more emphatic by it: "Gold thou shalt have, the richest earthly treasures, but above all, and crowning all, the blessing of God." The view here taken was held by the best of the old commentators cited in POOLE's Synopsis; it is clearly maintained by ROSENMUELLER, and partially by UMBREIT. It is confirmed by the old Versions, especially the Syriac, which is remarkably clear: "Thou shalt gather (תכנש, *lay up, treasure up*) silver like dust, and gold of Ophir like the sands of the sea."

[27] Ver. 25. **Thy precious ore.** A superlative word is wanted for the Hebrew intensive plural, בְּצָרִין.

[28] Ver. 25. **Silver from the mine.** Literally, *silver of toilings*—obtained by hard labor, either from the depths of the earth (see xxviii. 3, 9), or from the high mountains (comp. Psalm xcv. 4, תוֹעֲפוֹת הָרִים, rendered "*strength of the hills*," or *labors of the hills*). It is the radical idea of יָעֵף, *to be weary*—that which is obtained with great pains.

[29] Ver. 29. **Aloft**—גֵּוָה=גַּאֲוָה, *elevation*, or elation in general. It is best taken here interjectionally, like our phrases, *upward! onward.* So ZÖCKLER very happily: Wenn sie abwärts gehen, so sagst du, "empor!" The exhortation here is something like that which Eliphaz gave, iv. 3, 4, when he speaks of Job's having "strengthened the feeble and lifted up the sinking." So here, Job should use his experience for the raising up of the depressed.

[30] Ver. 30. **The guilty**, אִי־נָקִי, literally, *the not innocent*, a milder expression than *the guilty*. אִי is a negative, an apocopated form of אֵין, only occurring elsewhere I Sam. iv. 21, in the proper name *Ichabod* (אִי־כָבוֹד), improperly rendered, sometimes, *where is the glory?* It is literally *no glory*, or the *glory gone*. This particle אִי, as a negative, becomes quite common in the later Rabbinical Hebrew, as in the frequent phrases, אִי אֶפְשָׁר, *impossible*, אִי הֶכְרֵחַ, *non necessarium*. See, on this passage, the notes of CONANT and DELITZSCH. The latter regards Eliphaz as predicting what was actually fulfilled in himself and his companions, ch. xlii. 8, when they are delivered from condemnation and punishment on account of Job's superior purity.

CHAPTER XXIII.

1 Then answered Job and said:
2 Again, to day, my plaint—rebellious[1] still;
The hand[2] upon me heavier than my moans.
3 O that I knew where I might find Him[3]—knew
How I might come, even to His judgment seat.
4 There would I set my cause before His face;
There would I fill my mouth with arguments;
5 Would know the words that He would answer me,
And mark what He would say.
6 'Gainst me would He set forth His mighty[4] strength?
Ah, no—not that—but He would look on me.
7 A righteous one there pleads[5] with Him;
And from my Judge shall I be ever free.

GENERAL NOTE. Chap. xxiii. seems to mark an interval, or a new scene, or simply a new day, in the dramatic movement. EWALD thinks the discussion extended over several days. This is very probable. When the friends first came, they sat in silence with the sufferer, "seven days and seven nights,"—a mode of expression denoting a number of days at least. What is there improbable in the supposition that days, with intervening nights, were occupied with the discussion itself. Still less improbable is the thought that there were intervals of silence. It would be in harmony with the ways of the Arabian Consessus, marked by patience, and a deliberate waiting of one party for another, to give time for reply or silent thought. And how appropriate would this be in the case of the suffering, exhausted Job. The pauses of silence in the midst of his speeches are elsewhere alluded to, but more or less of an interval may come between some, or all of them, taken as wholes. This chap. xxiii. with its peculiar commencement, certainly does not look like an immediate reply to the preceding speech of Eliphaz. In the very first words, Job seems absorbed in himself, in his own sad case, and although, in the course of it, there are some things which seem to have been suggested by the previous speaker, yet, in the main, it has very much the character of an outburst of feeling, betraying little consciousness of any antecedent or present outward surroundings. Again—they must have had some time to sleep—the friends, at least, though Job could not sleep for pain (see vii. 4)—and the preceding speech of Eliphaz seems evidently to have been in the evening, or in the night somewhat advanced, when "the crown" of brilliant stars, right over head, presented such an appearance of extraordinary altitude. As shown in the notes to xxii. 12, the language in which that vivid night scene is painted reveals emotion, such as must have been felt by actual spectators. Such words were never used by any one speaking in the daytime. Then, again, there is in the close of the speech of Eliphaz a falling off, as it were, from the former harshness, especially as shown in ver. 5 and onwards. A more soothing tone is adopted, as though, soothed himself by the contemplation of the silent heavens, he meant to calm the mind of Job, by a picture of returning prosperity and new gifts of grace,—thus leaving him to get what rest he could. How the others pass the night we are not told, although they must have been very near him. Thus viewed, the commencing words of ch. xxiii. may be taken in their most literal sense of *hodie*, *to-day*, and not as a mere intensive expression for the present moment: "Even now," as DELITZSCH takes it, or "after all our efforts." That makes a fair sense, though the one here given is not only the more literal, but the more impressive. Job has been moaning all the night upon his couch of ashes (see vii. 4), and when morning breaks, the first thing heard from him is that mournful refrain, that wailing complaint of God's estrangement, which makes all their labored advice indifferent to him. It may be noted, too, that the stricter sense of *hodie* is expressed by גם denoting addition, *again*, *still more*, *another day* of sorrow and reproach. So RENAN:

Encore, une fois ma plainte.

And thus he sends up that cry of the first verse which he had been laboring though unable to repress.

[1] Ver. 1. **Rebellious still.** The weight of authority is in favor of giving מְרִי the sense which would naturally come from מָרָה instead of מָרַר, although the two forms are allied. In the present passage, too, they would come to very much the same thing. DELITZSCH renders it, *biddeth defiance*. ZÖCKLER, in a similar way, as also EWALD and UMBREIT. RENAN, appeleé révolte. Still it does not necessarily mean rebellion against God, but rather rebellion against all his own efforts to suppress his impassioned grief. It bursts forth in spite of all he can do. And this is in harmony with the second clause: *heavier than my groaning*.

[2] Ver. 1. **The hand upon me.** It is only a true translation of יָדִי, and of its possessive suffix of the 1st person, if we take יָד, hand, for the *plague* sent upon him,—as the weight of authority, old and new, seems to require. Severe affliction is so frequently denoted in Hebrew by the words יַד יְהוָה, *the hand of the Lord*, that the ellipsis naturally arises, and the word *hand* alone is used for the whole phrase. See Ps. xxxix. 11, where נֶגַע, *blow* or *plague*, in the 1st clause, is equivalent to תִּגְרַת יָדְךָ, *the attack of thy hand*, in the second. It may seem harsh to us, but to the Hebrews it would be more easy and natural than to use *hand* literally, as DELITZSCH does, for the organ as the instrument for the outward suppression of inward feeling: "*my hand lieth heavily on my groaning.*"

[3] Ver. 3. **O, that I knew where I might find him!** The Psalmist would have said, *find my God*, אֵלִי or אֱלֹהַי. The absence of such personal expressions in Job's speeches is a peculiar feature of the book. It is an evidence all through, of the great want which made Job's chief affliction—that hiding of God's countenance he so mourns for here. There is something, too, very significant in his apparent avoidance, sometimes, of the Divine name: *might find* HIM. It has occasionally, something of an angry look, as in iii. 20: "Why does *He* give light to the wretched?" Here, however, there is a deep pathos in it: "O that I might find *Him*"—Him, my estranged God, whom my soul seeketh, but whom I hardly dare to name.

[4] Ver. 6. **His mighty strength.** The reference does not seem to be to the idea sometimes expressed, that a man could not live if God appeared to him in His majesty. There is meant rather the strength of argument (יָרִיב). Would He "be strict to mark iniquity?" Would He set out the tremendous claims of His law and justice? Something inspires Job to say, *Ah no; He would just look at me* (יָשִׂים לֵב *put His heart upon me*, as the ellipsis is usually filled up), have regard to me,—see my misery; He would "remember that I am but dust."

[5] Ver. 7. **There pleads with him.** This is the simplest and most literal rendering of the four Hebrew words of the text. There is no need of putting in any potential or subjunctive signs, such as *may*, *might*, *could*, *would*,

8 Lo, to the East I go; He is not there;
Toward the West, but I perceive Him not.
9 To His wondrous working on the North,[6] I look, but look in vain;
In the void South[7] He hides Himself, where nought can I behold.
10 But my most secret[8] way, He knows it well;
He's trying me; I shall come forth as[9] gold.
11 My foot hath held His steps.
His way have I observed, nor turned aside.
12 The precepts of His lips I have not shunned;
More than my own behest, His counsels have I prized.
13 But He is ever One;[10] who turneth Him?
And what His soul desires, 'tis that He does.
14 The law ordained for me He now performs;
And many a like decree remains with Him.
15 Therefore it is I tremble so before Him;
I think of Him, and I am sore afraid.

würde, etc. They may be inferred, if the reader chooses, since, in English, *pleads* (indicative in form) may be equivalent to *may* or *would plead*, if the context demands it; as though it were said, that is the place where a righteous one *pleads*, (may plead) with Him. It may also be remarked that ישר is also used impersonally for *justice, integrity*, as in Psalm cxi. 8, where it is joined with *truth*; so that it might be rendered: there *justice* pleads, or is pleading with Him. But such a personification is hardly to be expected in Job. It may be held that the sense usually given is the nearer one, and the Rationalist may, therefore, be content with it; but that does not prevent one from taking a higher and wider idea, if the language fairly suggests it; since Holy Scripture, regarded as given by God whatever may be the method of inspiration, may be rationally treated as having a vast fulness of meaning,—not *double senses* strictly, or enigmatical, but ascending ideas, or stories of thought, the lower the basis of the higher, according to the spiritual-mindedness of the biblical student. When the clause is rendered in its simplest form: "*a righteous One there pleads with Him*," it suggests the thought of the Great Intercessor. It is, too, not altogether foreign to the book. It brings up again that mysterious idea which somehow came into the mind of Job, xvi. 21, born in him, and forced out of him, as it would seem, by his extreme anguish or a sense of his spiritual desolation:

> Whilst unto God mine eye is dropping tears,
> That *He Himself* would plead for man *with God*,
> As one of Adam's race doth for his brother plead.

There may be here, also, something of that same "melancholy conceit" (as UMBREIT styles it) which Job gets into his crazy head, of "God's standing by him against God." (see Note xvi 21). This righteous One personates, or is personated by, every other one who thus pleads for man on earth. The more near sense suits here, and may be taken, therefore, as the true exegetical interpretation on which all else must be grounded; but what right has this "higher criticism," as it calls itself, to shut out that greater idea to which the lower mounts, and which so touchingly appears in the other passage: *God only can help us with God*. On the rendering *plead*, see Note xvi. 21. שָׁם may refer to circumstance or condition as well as place. See Pss. cxxxii. 17; cxxxiii. 3.

[6] Ver. 9. **On the North.** The North is the region of the most brilliant celestial phenomena. It is probably suggested to Job by what Eliphaz had said, the night before, about "the crown of stars." It is not, however, a view of the vastness of God in space which Job so much desires, as *nearness*, or a sense of His spiritual presence. See Note xli. 12. בעשׂתו here (*in his working*) must refer to some special manifestations of the Divine creative and supporting power in the constellations that surround the pole; and, therefore, the epithet in the translation is necessary to bring out what in the original speaking had sufficient emphasis without it.

[7] Ver. 9. **In the void South.** Here, too, the epithet is used as really belonging to the significance of the language, and as justified by the figure contained in יַעְטֹף. It is the same as that given by the phrase חַדְרֵי תֵמָן, *the secret chambers of the South*, ix. 9. Job points to the Southern region of the heavens which seems to be over Teman. It is because few constellations appear there as seen from the Northern Hemisphere. It is more like void space as compared with the brilliant North. Or there may be some idea of the hidden underworld toward which that region is imagined to be the way. See VIRG. *Georg.* I., 242.

> Hic vertex nobis semper *sublimis*; at illum
> *Sub pedibus* Styx atra videt, Manesque profundi.

It is to be lamented that this sublime passage should be marred by two of our best commentators. This is done by UMBREIT, who most unnecessarily goes to an Arabic word, which is really not cognate, to get the sense of *covering* for עשׂה, common Hebrew verb as it is, and by DELITZSCH, who whilst refuting UMBREIT commits a similar fault in respect to the יעטף of the second clause,—giving it the Arabic sense of *turning aside*, instead of the Hebrew sense of *covering, wrapping* (Pss. lxv. 14; civ. 2). Between them they have effaced two plain Hebrew words, and blotted out a most glorious contrast so conspicuously set forth in the celestial appearances themselves.

[8] Ver. 10. **But my most secret way:** דרך עמדי. The word עִמָּדִי denotes something *nearer*, more *familiar* than עִם would have done. See Ps. xxiii. 4, כי אתה עמדי, "*for thou art with me.*" *My way that is nearest to me*, most *familiar* to me, and yet better known to him than it is to myself. The phrase דרך עמדי, as used here, may help us to the meaning of that controverted place, ix. 35, לא כן עמדי, *not so with me*, which would seem to give us the opposite idea of *de-rangement*, or being *not one's-self—out of himself*—as there rendered. It is there the wild, confused, delirious state, instead of the well-known familiar way of the soul's movements. Hence the same metaphor of *de-rangement*, in so many languages. See Note on ix. 35. **But he knows.** This is another example of a sudden rising of hope and confidence following immediately after the expression of great darkness or bewilderment. The thought of *being known* to God,—of God "*looking at him*" (ver. 6) though he cannot see his beholder,—this immediately revives his sinking spirits by assuring him of the Divine providence, as well as his own seeing God would have done. It was the skeptical feeling, the dark shadow of a theism, or fatality, coming over his soul that so distressed him. *De profundis clamavit.*

[9] Ver. 10. **As gold.** זהב, *aurum purissimum, the shining gold*, by way of contrast, and in reference, probably, to what Eliphaz says of בֶּצֶר xxii. 24. The true gold is Job himself—the true "silver from the mine" (xxii. 25) that God is so mysteriously working.

[10] Ver. 13. **Ever one.** בְּאֶחָד: Literally, *in one*. *In one way*, it may be; but the best commentators regard it as *beth essentiæ*.

16 For thus it is that God makes weak my heart;
It is the Omnipotent amazes me.
17 Not from[11] the darkness am I thus cast down,
Nor yet because thick darkness veils my face.

[11] Ver. 17. **Not from the darkness.** The rendering given of this verse in E. V., and which corresponds to that of UMBREIT and other commentators of repute, makes no intelligible sense. It would represent Job as having this awful dread upon his soul *because* God had not "cut him off before the darkness" came, and then, with a feeble tautology besides, *because* He, God, "covered the darkness from his face." It all turns upon the rendering of כִּי (or rather the idea for which כִּי gives the reason), and on preserving the analogy between the מִפְּנֵי and the מִפָּנָיו of ver. 15, and the מִפְּנֵי and מִפָּנַי of ver. 17. The כִּי gives a *protest* rather than a *reason*. It was not the darkness that he dreaded so much, as a thing personal to himself, or the difficulty of understanding his own case, as that awful feeling which came over him when thinking of the confusion, blind disorder, apparently, which seems to prevail in all the affairs of the world, especially human affairs. This protest seems to be in reply to what Eliphaz had said, xxii. 11, about the darkness which covered Job, and which, he intimates, had been brought upon him by his sins:

Or darkness that thou canst not see,
Or water floods that overwhelm thy soul.

See the conclusive reasons for the rendering here adopted, as given by DELITZSCH, EWALD, DILLMAN, and ZÖCKLER. The other rendering: "*Because* I was not cut off *before* the darkness, neither hath He covered the darkness *from* my face," would require a sudden change in the use of מִפְּנֵי, מִפָּנַי, ver. 17, as compared with מִפָּנָיו and מִפָּנָיו of ver. 15, or from the causal sense, "*on account of*," to the *avertive* sense of "*before*," besides the wrong rendering of נִצְמַתִּי. In the second clause of ver. 17, the מ in מִפָּנַי may have its force on פָּנַי immediately following, as CONANT well remarks, or on the whole clause: *not for myself, whose face darkness has covered*—or: not on account of the fact that darkness (אֹפֶל black midnight darkness) hath covered my face. This gives a sense most grand as well as significant. Job had lost the spiritual vision of God. *He could not find Him*,—could not trace Him in his works or in his providences,—all was dark *in respect to himself*. But there was still support in the belief that *God knew him, looked upon him*, ver. 6, *knew his way perfectly*, ver. 10. Whilst this hope remained, he was not altogether lost. But the other thought of *fixed law* which is nothing else than *arbitrary* decree (vers. 13, 14), in other words, a blind fatality, whether called God or nature, which had no regard to human affairs at all, no moral concern for man, this was anguish unalleviated. It was this that weakened, הֵרַךְ, in modern phrase, *broke his heart* (ver. 16). It was when he thought of this, that "trembling seized all his flesh." xxi. 6. נִצְמַתִּי, ver. 17. Not *cut off*, but *reduced to silence*, awed, confounded.

CHAPTER XXIV.

1 How is it,[1]—times from God are not concealed—
That they who know Him do not see His days?

[1] Ver. 1. **How is it?** EWALD, UMBREIT, HEILIGSTEDT, SCHLOTTMANN, DELITZSCH, ZÖCKLER—a formidable array of authorities—take this as a direct question: "Why are not times reserved (laid up, appointed) by the Almighty?" In the same way, most of the older commentators cited in POOLE'S Synopsis. The English Version, CARTWRIGHT, LUD. DE DIEU, and others, give it a different turn: *Quare quum Deo non sint occulta tempora, nihilominus tamen, etc.*: "*Why, seeing times*," *etc.*, or "*why if*," *etc.* The Vulgate makes it a direct declaration: *ab Omnipotente non sunt abscondita tempora.* The Syriac has it: *Why are not the wicked hid from God?* as though there had been read רשעים, instead of עתים. The *ἀσεβεῖς ἄνδρες* of the LXX. looks the same way. The authorities just cited generally take נצפנו in its secondary sense of *laid up*, hence *reserved, appointed*; though some of them give it the primary meaning; *Why are times not hidden from the Almighty?* As though Job meant to intimate, querulously, that it were better to think He knew nothing about human affairs than that He let things go on in such darkness and disorder. CONANT adheres here, substantially, to our E. V.: "*Why, if times are not hidden, etc.*" The translator is inclined to go with him. Job is speaking according to the hypothesis of his friends. The question, taken directly according to the usual force of מַדּוּעַ (which means more than *why*—rather *for what reason*, Gr. *τί μαθών*), would be a strong affirmation of the certainty of the fact, that *times are not reserved by the Almighty*—a position which Job would hardly dare to take directly, and which, certainly, he would not address to the others as an *admitted* truth, or one they would not controvert. There is no difficulty about עתים and ימין. All understand them, the first, as denoting *events*, according to a frequent Biblical usage, and the second, days of retribution or of divine manifestations. The hypothetical idea is certainly very natural to the context, but what grammatical ground, it may be said, is there for it? An answer to this is found in the peculiar nature of the particle מַדּוּעַ, before adverted to. Another reason arises from the fact, that this particle certainly has an influence upon the second clause, even if we take ו, in וידעיו, as a mere copulative. "Why are times not reserved, and why do those who know Him not see?" This would make it a negation of both propositions, whereas from the context, or rather from the whole chapter, the thing denied or doubted would rather seem to be the connection between them, or some truth admitted in relation to God which is regarded as inconsistent with another having relation to man. There is, however, no absolute need of supplying any such particles as *if* or *seeing that*. The broken style of Job's utterance becomes clear when literally and closely followed. It is simply taking the words as they stand, only throwing the force of מדוע on the second clause, and thus giving the intervening part a parenthetical character. In this way, ו becomes *inferential*, that is, it connects by way of inference, or thoughts rather than words. It may then be thus fairly paraphrased: "How is it?—times are *not hidden* from God, you say—*and* yet (ו connecting illatively, or one fact with another) those who know Him, or claim to know Him, as you claim to know Him, and to speak for Him, do not see His days of retribution?" מדוע, *how is this?* מה ידוע, *τί μαθών*, as GESENIUS gives its etymology. "*Times* (*events*) *not* hidden from the Almighty:" that this idea is intended by Job in this first verse, appears from the fact of its pervading his argument and all the pictures he draws of bad men and their incomprehensible impunity. This is the burthen of his complaint: God *sees it all*, knows it all, yet seems to pay no attention to it (see ver. 12)—*does not heed the enormity*, lets it go on—"lets the wicked feel confidence" in their impunity (ver. 23), though all the time "His eyes are upon them," and upon their doings. It should, however, never be forgotten that all these strong pictures of Job are by way of protest against the representations of the others. He himself has some dream of a great *dies retributionis*, according to the best interpretation of xxi. 30, but here he confines himself to *their* views of the *present state of things*, maintaining that to all appearance, whether the wicked prosper, or whether they meet with misfortunes (there being no real inconsistency, or such as troubles many

2 Yes,[2]—land marks they remove;
They seize on flocks they pasture as their own.
3 The orphan's ass they drive away;
They take the widow's ox in pledge.
4 They turn the needy from their right;[3]
[At sight of them] the wretched hide themselves.
5 Behold them! Like the desert-roaming ass,
So go they early to their work—their prey;
The barren wild their bread,[4] their children's food.
6 These reap *his*[5] fodder in the field—
The evil man's—*his* vintage do they glean.
7 Naked they[6] lodge—no rag to hide their shame;
They have no covering in the cold.
8 Wet from the mountain storm,
All shelterless they make the rock their[7] bed.
9 The *others*[8] tear the orphan from the breast;
Even from the suffering poor they take the pawn.
10 Stript of their garments[9] go they forth,
And in their hunger do they bear the sheaf.
11 The oil within *their*[10] walls they press,
And tread their flowing wine vats thirsting[11] still.
12 From the city[12] filled with dead, the groans ascend;

commentators, in his presenting both sides), God seems to have nothing to do with it, does not interfere with it, leaves things to take their own course, though *seeing it all the while.* Job is in a strange state of mind, bordering on a kind of fatalism; but his extreme positions are not so much his own better feeling as they are the ground to which he is driven in showing up the fallacies and one-sidedness of *their* views. This thought, kept in mind, will furnish a key to much that has seemed dark and contradictory in the chapter.

[2] Ver. 2. **Yes, landmarks.** Here Job enters abruptly upon specifications of events showing the disorders God permits in the world. The whole chapter is a vivid picture of this, although the items are strangely mixed together, as though the passionateness of the speaker carried him out of all method. We have here the wretched vagabond wicked, the rich and powerful wicked, the suffering poor, the bold and dastard criminals, the murderer, the adulterer, the thief, characters of every grade, their prosperity and their misfortunes, the flight of the bad man (ver. 18), whether it be the thief pursued by the popular curse, or the fallen tyrant fleeing from the hootings of the proletaires, his rising again to power (ver. 22), his dying like all other men, the common grave, the worm, the oblivion, all set before us in a few touches that no effort of Dickens or Victor Hugo could rival. In the midst of it comes the brief-sketched scene of the stormed city (ver. 12), the dying groans, the wailing of the departing spirits of the slain, and what runs through all, and affects us more than all, the thought of God above, who sees, yet seemingly "cares for none of these things." This is the polemic aim of the picture as against the friends. Job's darkness has a background of truth, and we need not therefore fear to say, that it is better than their false light.

[3] Ver. 4. **Their right.** Heb. דרך, *their way*, their home. That to which they have been accustomed. DEL.

[4] Ver. 5. **The barren wild their bread.** Description of a wild gypsy life.

[5] Ver. 6. **Reap his fodder.** The general sense clear, the particular applications uncertain. DELITZSCH seems to give the best interpretation: "The bad rich man has these vagabond proletaires to cut his *fodder*, but does not entrust to them the reaping of the better kinds of grain. So also he prudently hesitates to employ them as vintagers, but makes use of their labor to gather the straggling, late ripening grapes. In this and the following verses, the transitions from the one class to the other are very rapid. The most concise way to express it in a translation was to italicise one of the classes.

[6] Ver. 7. **Naked they lodge.** The vagabonds again. The transition very abrupt, but all the more vivid.

[7] Ver. 8. **The rock their bed.** Literally, *they embrace the rock.*

[8] Ver. 9. **Others tear;** the widow's child, as mentioned just above. These are the wicked rich as distinguished from the proletaires, or reckless poor.

[9] Ver. 10. **Their garments.** The pawned garment taken from the poor.

[10] Ver. 11. **Their:** the rich. **They:** the poor.

[11] Ver. 11. **Thirsting still.** Not allowed to drink of it; even as the hungry laborer not allowed to taste the grain he is carrying. Their thirst aggravated by the sight of the wine flowing from the presses which they turn.

[12] Ver. 12. **The city filled with dead.** Literally, *the city of the dead.* Here comes suddenly a new picture of a city taken by storm. The accents connect מתים closely with עיר, and if they are to be regarded, the former cannot be the subject of ינאקו, as EWALD and others render it, whatever may be the meaning of the noun. The vowel pointing, in most copies, is מְתִים, generally rendered *men*, which would give the rendering in the one case, *men groan*, and, in the other, *men from the city*—a very feeble sense in both cases. DELITZSCH tries to remedy this by rendering it *men of war*, with a reference to Deuteronomy ii. 34; iii. 6; Judg. xx. 48. But *men* in those passages are simply so named in distinction from *women*. In the translations of EWALD, UMBREIT, DILLMANN, ZÖCKLER, it is rendered *Sterbende*, the *dying*, which CONANT also adopts. In this they follow the Syriac, which derived it from the reading מֵתִים instead of מְתִים. The English reader will see how slight the difference in the vowel pointing, (ֵ) instead of (ְ), and how easily the change might be made. The Syriac, from an unpointed text, took the reading that seemed most natural. It also appears in some Hebrew codices, and is well defended by DE ROSSI as presenting the best parallelism to חללים, the *slain* or *wounded*. Those who have adopted the reading מֵתִים, which they render *the dying*, connect it with ינאקו, *the dying groan*, thereby disregarding the accents. These, however, may be observed if we give to מֵתִים its true rendering, which is not the *dying*, but the *dead, past participle: From the city of the dead*, so called because of the vast numbers of the dead lying within it—*from the city filled with* dead. Then there may be given to ינאקו a general subject, *they groan*, or it may be taken impersonally, as in the translation

And shriek aloud the[13] spirits of the slain;
But God heeds not the dire[14] enormity.

13 They,[15] too,—those enemies of light,
Who take no knowledge of its ways,
Who stay not in its trodden[16] paths;
14 The murderer—at the dawn[17] he rises up,
To slay the poor—the destitute;
By night he plays the thief.
15 The adulterer's eye waits for the twilight shade.
No one, says he, shall see the way I take;
A masking veil[18] he puts upon his face.
16 Through houses in the dark the burglar digs.
In covert[19] do they keep by day,—
All strangers to the light.

given above. The form נאק as distinguished from the more usual אנק, and as having more of an onomatopic resemblance to the thing signified, is used especially of the groans of the slain, as in Ezek. xxx. 24. "I will break the arms of Pharaoh and he shall *groan the groanings* of the slain." This greatly favors, too, the reading of מְתִים. Here, as in other parts of the Hebrew Scriptures, the authors of the accents, if they belong not rather, in some way, to the Divine originals, have shown their spiritual acuteness. By the connection they have made, ינאקו stands by itself, as it were; the subject is left to the imagination of the hearer, as something well known, and whose suppression, therefore, is more pathetic than its mention: "*they* groan." In this position, too, it becomes more strictly the imperfect of description, instead of mere narration: "*they* are *groaning*—groans are *continually* ascending." All this makes it the more emotional. The force of it may have been given by a look or a gesture, but the strongest expression of it in a translation demands some interjectional word or phrase: *hark! how they groan!* as though the narrator brought the scene right before him.

[13] Ver. 12. **The spirits of the slain.** נֶפֶשׁ may be rendered *spirit* (or, collectively, *spirits*) as denoting the going out of the breath or life, or the *soul*, as DELITZSCH renders it. So UMBREIT: ruft laut die Seele der zum Tod Verwundeten; ZÖCKLER the same way. It need not be relied upon as proof of any peculiar notions about the separate existence of the soul, and yet is in perfect harmony with other ancient descriptions to the same effect. How often does Homer represent the spirits (ψυχαὶ) of those slain in battle as going out *wailing*, *shrieking*, τρίζουσαι, and often predicting the doom of their slayers, according to that very old belief in the vaticinating power of the departing spirit. So Hector's ghost takes its mourning departure to the Unseen World, Iliad xxii. 362.

> ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ ῥεθέων πταμένη Ἄϊδόσδε βεβήκει.
> ὃν πότμον ΓΟΟΩΣΑ—
> *Bewailing* his sad doom.

[14] Ver. 12. **Dire enormity.** The first feeling in the study of this passage is, that the reading תְּפִלָּה, *prayer*, which the Syriac followed is the right one. It has led UMBREIT and CONANT, with other excellent commentators, so to render it: "*God heeds not the prayer.*" There comes to mind, however, that rule of criticism, sound in the main, that the more rare form is to be preferred, on the rational ground that a change to it from the apparently easier is less likely than the contrary course. The view is strengthened, too, when we look carefully at the idea conveyed by the other form תִּפְלָה, though at first it seems strange. It is an unusual word, and its etymological sense, *without salt*, *ineptum*, (see this form Job i. 22; Jer. xxiii. 13; and another from the same root תָּפֵל Job vi. 6; Lam. ii. 14) strikes us as poor, and unsuitable to so vivid and impressive a context. From this primary sense, however, of *insulsitas*, *unsaltedness*, *insipidity*, comes that of *absurdity*, *monstrosity*, whence it is applied to anything odious and *abominable*, that which can be reduced to no rule of consistency—*abnormal*, *abhorrent*—an *anomaly*, as DELITZSCH renders it. Hence the term chosen by the translator from a similar etymology, though having more force than the word of DELITZSCH—an *enormity* (*e norma*) out of all rule, utterly irrational. The more it is examined, the more it will be seen to give, not only the truer sense lexically, but the more impressive,—the epithet only calling *attention* to it, without adding to its meaning. It is a monstrous enormity, so considered, a hideous blot on the face of creation; and yet, according to Job's picture, God pays no attention to it. Horrible enough when we think of some sacked town, or castle, in remote Idumea; but how is the feeling of such an enormity increased when we bring to remembrance other scenes of slaughter far surpassing it in modern warfare,—of Borodino, for example, or Sedan; or when we call up other bloody pictures from Ancient History, such as THUCYDIDES' account of the terrible defeat of the Athenians in the land and sea fight at Syracuse (close of Book vii. 70, 71). Some of the language is very much like that of this verse of Job, the mingled wailing and shouting of the combatants, "the cry of the slayers and the slain," ὀλλύντων τε καὶ ὀλλυμένων, in describing which the dry historian is carried up to the Homeric grandeur of language and conception. Another reason for preferring תִּפְלָה is that ישמיע would have been the most natural verb to follow תְּפִלָּה (prayer), though ישים, with the usual ellipsis, would suit either reading. The VULGATE renders, Et Deus inultum abire non patitur; LXX. Αὐτὸς δὲ διατί τούτων ἐπισκοπὴν οὐ πεποίηται, which may suit either reading.

[15] Ver. 13. **They too.** הֵמָּה emphatic. A new class mentioned, but spoken of as well known—*those notorious characters*.

[16] Ver. 13. **Trodden paths,** *well known*, נְתִיבוֹת, in distinction from the more general word דרך—like Gr. ἀτραπός. Compare also the same word, Job. xxxviii. 20: "*paths to its house*," that is, the light.

[17] Ver. 14. **At the dawn.** Literally *at the light*, the first beginning of day-break. There is no contradiction here, as MERX maintains, of the previous description. They are called enemies of light as much in a moral as in a physical aspect. But even in the latter it is all consistent. The murderer starts at the break of day to surprise and slay the poor as he goes forth to his labor. Or the emphasis, as is most likely, is on יקום, denoting not his rising from his bed, but his sudden rising up from his ambush where he has been lying all night, waiting for his victim, whom he surprises at break of day.

[18] Ver. 15. **A masking veil.** סתר has more properly the abstract sense of concealment, here put for the instrument of concealment, whether a veil or a mask.

[19] Ver. 16. **In covert do they keep.** Literally, *they seal themselves up.* למו, *by themselves*, or giving, as ל sometimes does, a reflex or hithpahel sense to the verb, though in such cases some call it pleonastic—as לֶךְ לְךָ

17 Yes, morning[20] is as death shade to them all;
For (in it) they discern, each one, the terrors of the dark.
18 Light as[21] the bubble on the water's face,
He flees,—accursed his portion on the earth;—
Nor turns he ever to the vineyard[22] way.

19 As drought and heat bear off the melting[23] snows,
So Sheol those[24] who sin.
20 The womb[25] (the mother's heart) forgets him there;
Whilst on him sweetly feeds[26] the worm.
He comes in memory no more;
And broken like a tree Injustice[27] lies.

21 Again; the man who wrongs the barren,[28] childless one,
And to the widow no compassion[29] shows.
22 The strong, too, by his might, he bears[30] away;
He riseth up; no one is sure of life.

הָלַךְ לוֹ, Gen. xii. 1, בְּרַח לְךָ, Amos vii. 12. This view is now generally adopted, but the old rendering of E. V., TREMELLIUS and others: "*which they have marked* (VULGATE, *agreed on*) *for themselves by day*," has some claims to consideration. The absence of ו gives it very much the appearance of a relative clause, and the verb *to seal* may easily denote anything put upon the house for recognition. RASCHI tells us that some of their Rabbins explain it of the thieves putting balsam אפרסמון upon the treasure houses discovered during the day, that they might know them by the smell in the night.

[20] Ver. 17. **Morning.** DELITZSCH would make *morning* the predicate: "*The depth of the night is as the dawn of the morning;*" but his reasons, drawn from the position of the accents, are not satisfactory. The other idea is the more consistent one: the morning is to them the time of fear. They recognize in it the terrors of the night, or what to other men are such. A change of number again, יַכִּיר; but to be taken distributively: each one of them, whether murderer, adulterer, or thief.

[21] Ver. 18. **Light as the bubble.** See the same comparison Hosea x. 7, "*as the foam upon the waters*," swiftly gliding away. It is the thief making his escape when the morning terrors come, as shown by its connection with the previous verse. The simplest and most literal view is the best and clearest. It removes immediately the difficulties which some find, as though Job here was contradicting himself in pointing out something unfavorable to the wicked man. For this reason it has been turned into a prayer, a wish: "*light may he be, etc.*," but without a single mark in the language to countenance any such idea. It is a part of his picture, even if taken as describing generally the transitoriness of the evil life, and it is at once explained by keeping ever in view the two leading ideas contained in the first verse, namely, events (*times*) known to God, but no visible signs of retribution coming from His hand. The wicked man's misfortunes are freely mentioned, the popular curse pursuing him, his death, and being carried off to Sheol, his fleeing and keeping out of the way of the vineyards; but these come from social and natural causes, not from any seen hand of God. It is just as the drought and heat carry off the snow waters. No more appearance of retribution in the one case than in the other. Both classes of events alike confirm his argument.

[22] Ver. 18. **The way of the vineyards** is the open, known, cultivated country, in contrast with the forests, or the desert. See the similar expression: *the way to the city.* Eccles. x. 15.

[23] Ver. 19. **Melting snows.** This is the best expression the translator could find for מֵימֵי שֶׁלֶג, *waters of snow; the watery snow*; unless it refers to the streams that have become swollen from the snows; but the sense of *quick carrying off* which is in גזל would not so well suit the drying up of full streams. Compare, however, Job vi. 17. For the application of this, see remarks in note above.

[24] Ver. 19. **Those who.** The second clause is an example of the extreme Hebrew conciseness; and yet the English nearly admits of it without sacrificing clearness: *So Sheol, who have sinned*—a construction barely tolerable. If we regard *who* as containing the object in the subject (like the relative *what*), just as in the Hebrew of the above the relative or object is contained in the personal pronoun existing in the form of the verb.

[25] Ver. 20. **The womb.** Compare Isaiah xlix. 15.

[26] Ver. 20. **Feeds the worm.** A most striking, yet mournful picture: Dead and gone; forgotten by the maternal heart; but the worm loves him—feeds sweetly on him. Comp. xxi. 33. There is no need of the sense *sucks* here, although it may be primary in מתק (compare מצץ), unless it carry the idea of sucking with relish; since the thought of pleasure or sweetness must not be lost from the comparison.

[27] Ver. 20. **Injustice.** The simple rendering of עַוְלָה will do here, without taking it for the unjust man. It would only make a repetition; whilst the idea of his *injustice*, too, lying prostrate like a broken uprooted tree which can no longer yield him any fruit, makes quite an addition to the picture. If anything is to be supplied, it might perhaps be rendered his *unjust gain*, the cause put for the effect. The tree broken off, and no longer yielding, would represent this very well. If it is a personification, it might be taken as in the Bunyan style, the name given from the leading characteristic: Injustice, there he lies, uprooted like a tree.

[28] Ver. 21. **The barren childless.** This was esteemed a more desolate state than that of the widow, even the bereaved or childless widow.

[29] Ver. 21. **No compassion.** Negative phrases, like לֹא יֵיטִיב (for יֵיטִיב), are sometimes the most positive and severe in their significance: "*Does no good to the widow*," as UMBREIT and DELITZSCH render it, is very tame. *Not to do good* here is to be inhuman and unmerciful. It is not a mere selfish neglect. So בְּלִיַּעַל (*belial*) is not *unprofitableness* (its etymological significance), but utter vileness, and בְּנֵי בְלִיַּעַל (*sons of Belial*), the worst of men. So in Greek and Latin. Compare the ἀχρεῖος δοῦλος, the *unprofitable servant* of the gospel. In like manner, *in-imicus* is not merely *not a friend* (*non amicus*), but a positive enemy; *im-mitis*, not simply *not mild*, but most *fierce* and *cruel.*

[30] Ver. 22. **Bears away.** מָשַׁךְ here may have the Arabic sense, very near akin to the Hebrew of *seizing*, *holding fast*; Comp. Ps. xxviii. 3, although the common sense of *drawing*, *dragging away*, would suit very well. Whether this is a new character that here enters into the picture, or an old one brought up again, cannot be certainly decided. It looks some as though the one described, ver. 18, as pursued by the popular curse, whether robber or tyrant, had recovered power to the dismay of his enemies and of all others. "He rises up again," and they have to escape for their lives.

23 God lets them rest[31] in their security;
But still His eyes are ever on their ways.
24 They tower a little while, and straight are gone;
Brought low like all,[32] like all they're gathered in;
Even as the topmost ears are severed like the rest.

25 Is it not so? Who then shall prove me false?
Or bring to nought my words?

DELITZSCH makes God the subject of משך: "*He* (*God*) *preserveth the mighty.*" But there is not the least warrant for this on the face of the text, nor does he give any authority for the sense of *preserving* thus taken for the verb. Nowhere has משך any such meaning. Others, like UMBREIT, make אַבִּירִים the subject: Die Starken halten fest an ihrer Kraft. The singular verb itself is not an insuperable objection to this, although it is not easy, and no such indications appear as justify the collective use of the plural here, or the distributive use of the singular in some other verses. The context, too, is all against it. No intimation is given that the true subject of the verb here is not the same man, whoever he may be, that wronged "the childless barren," and "showed no compassion to the widow." He it is who, after his injustice to the weak, drags down his powerful foes. The conjunction ו would be sufficient to warrant such an inference, besides the structure of both verses pointing to a contrast as intended between these two varying classes of his victims, and thus making a completed picture. The verb יקום, too, seems to carry the idea of one who had once been overcome, but now rises up to a greater vengeance. Hence the strangely conflicting efforts at explanation; one class of commentators charging the others with holding untenable positions, until extreme men, like MERX, settle the whole thing, to their own satisfaction, by the most arbitrary changes in the text. Generally Job is not very logical; but in this chapter, he seems never to lose sight of the two leading ideas, before mentioned, with which he sets out in its beginning: *Events are not hidden from God, and yet those who profess to know Him do not see his visible days of retribution.* Both are maintained here. God lets the wicked go on in their security; but He is not favoring them in so doing. The second clause does not mean looking upon them for preservation, but simply what it says: "His eyes are on their ways;" or as it is said Prov. xv. 3: "beholding the *evil* and the *good.*" The language here reminds us of that which Paul uses Acts xvii. 30; when he speaks of God as *overlooking* the times (τοὺς μὲν χρόνους ὑπεριδὼν, Job's word עתים, ver. 1), not in the sense of *not seeing*, or *winking at* as our translation gives it, but of looking over, or beyond, to the great day when all shall be right; just as the German verb *übersehen* and our *overlook* may have both senses according to the context, or to the division of its parts. In interpreting this chapter, the memorable passage xxi. 30, though controverted, is not to be lost sight of. Neither are we to regard Job as denying a thing so undeniable, whether regarded in the light of history or of revelation, as the fact of there being sometimes visible divine retributions upon earth, striking, though rare. But it was this view of their *non-visibility*, or of their comparative *rarity*, that was here to be urged against extremely one-sided opponents, and every pious interruption of that argument would have been out of place.

31 Ver. 23. **God lets them rest.** Literally: "He grants to them that they may be stayed in confidence." God is doubtless the subject here of יתן, but the verse is not to be taken as indicating either favor or disfavor. DELITZSCH's version is so made as to give the first idea: "God giveth him rest, and he is sustained, and His eyes are over all their ways," that is, to preserve and prosper them. In this there is to be seen the influence of that idea which has so perverted the interpretation of this whole chapter. It is, that Job is solely intent on describing the prosperity of the wicked. But the contrary picture so comes out, in a number of verses, that no forcing can keep it out of sight.

32 Ver. 24. **Like all.** The force of כַּכֹּל, "*like all,*" goes through the clause.

CHAPTER XXV.

1 Then answered Bildad the Shuhite, and said:

2 To Him[1] belongs dominion—yea,[2] and fear.
'Tis He who makes the harmony[3] on high.

1 Ver. 2. **To Him.** Bildad would overwhelm the impenitent Job with a display of God's power and mighty works. He does this in a very grand style. As abstract truth, or regarded as something said *about* God (see remarks on the interpretation of אֵלַי, xlii. 7, INT. THEISM, pa. 85), it is better than Job's passionate expostulation; but the latter, it may be said, is nearer to the great mystery which the untried Bildad has little feeling of, much as he thinks he understands it in theory. RENAN says here: "Bildad, désespérant de vaincre l'impiété obstinée de Job, et pour montrer combien sa prétention d'arriver jusqu au trône de Dieu est insensée, cesse de le prendre à partie et se borne à exalter d'une manière générale la puissance divine."

2 Ver. 2. **Yea, and fear.** The conjunction ו seems to have the force of the double *et* in Latin—*both fear and dominion*—or, dominion and fear, too, as though he meant to terrify the daring Job who talks (xxiii. 3) of coming even to God's throne. Such a view is suggested by פַּחַד, a stronger word than יראה, *religious fear.* This denotes *dread, terror;* and, as thus making a climax, seems like something added to the idea. "*With Him is dominion,*" *etc.* It reminds us of the doxology to the Lord's Prayer: "*Thine is the kingdom, the glory.*"

3 Ver. 2. **The harmony.** Heb. שָׁלוֹם, *peace, pax, pactum*, as though referring to personal beings. Here, however, as spoken of the heavenly bodies, God's hosts or armies, it must mean a physical harmony—something like "the music of the spheres," or rather the higher thought of beauty and order out of which that Pythagorean conception arose. See Ps. xix. 5: "Their line (their vibrating musical string) hath gone out to the ends of the world." VULGATE: *Concordiam in sublimibus suis.* It is that idea of law as holding together the universe which all devout minds had long before Newton, although it was unknown in its mathematical

3 The number of His armies, who can count?
Or say o'er[4] whom His light doth not arise?
4 How then can man be just with God?
Or how can he be clean, of woman born?
5 Look to[5] the moon; behold! she pales her;
The stars, to *His* beholding, are not pure.
6 Much less a mortal man—corruption's[6] child—
The son[7] of man—the worm!

terms. It is admirably expressed by SOCRATES in the *Gorgias*, 508 A, though treated there as an old idea of the wise: "For they say, the sages, that community (*κοινωνίαν*), harmony, peace, holds together heaven and earth, and therefore do they call it Kosmos."

[4] Ver. 3. **O'er whom**—*arise.* Some would render יקום על *surpass:* God's light surpasses that of the moon and stars This is undoubtedly the idea, as appears in the verses following, but the more simple and literal rendering clearly expresses it. There is suggested, moreover, the idea of these lesser lights being but reflections from Him, "the Father of Lights," James i. 17. With the first clause of the verse compare Isaiah xl. 26.

[5] Ver. 5. **Look to the moon:** *even to the moon.* עַד here expresses degree: *usque ad*, עד מאד—even to the moon so high. It goes with הֵן in calling attention.

[6] Ver. 6. **Corruption's child.** Not merely to avoid an unpleasant tautology in English may this rendering be used, but as really giving that fuller etymological significance of the word which must have been felt in the original, since רִמָּה, the generic term for worm, is so called as the supposed product of putrefaction; see Exod. xvi. 24. אֱנוֹשׁ, man *individually*, poor and wretched, *mortalis*, *βροτός*.

[7] Ver. 6. **The son of man.** בֶּן אָדָם, man *generically*—the human race, *humanity*. See xvii. 14:

> To *corruption* have I said—my father thou;
> My mother and my sister—to the worm.

How the Bible expresses the physical lowliness and the spiritual greatness of man—especially redeemed man united by faith to the Eternal—may be seen from Isaiah xlii. 14, 10: "Fear not thou *worm*, Jacob; fear thou not; for I am with thee, I strengthen thee; I help thee; I uphold thee by the right hand of my righteousness. *Thou art mine.*"

CHAPTER XXVI.

1 Then answered Job and said:

2 How hast thou helped the powerless?
Or saved the feeble[1] arm?
3 How hast thou counseled the unlearned?
Or truth,[2] in its immensity, made known?
4 Of Whom[3] hast thou declaimed?[4]
Whose inspiration is it comes from thee?

[1] Ver. 2. **Feeble arm.** Man of the feeble arm.

[2] Ver. 3. **Truth in its immensity.** The expression לָרֹב almost always denotes a vastness beyond count or measure; as Deut. i. 10; x. 22, *etc.*, *stars for multitude:* Josh. xi. 4; 2 Samuel xiii. 5, *etc.*, *sand on the sea shore, etc.;* Judg. vi. 5; vii. 12, *the innumerable locusts;* I Kings ix. 27, the countless willows of the valley, and so on in many other places. תּוּשִׁיָּה here suggests the same idea as in xii. 16, where see note; as also EXCURSUS V, pa. 188.

[3] Ver. 4. **Of whom.** אֶת מִי. This is rendered by some, *with whom*, that is, *by the aid of whom.* It agrees with a sense that is given to אֶת when regarded as a preposition, and harmonizes quite well with the question in the second clause. UMBREIT renders it *to whom.* So DELITZSCH and others, *whom hast thou taught*, making it the subject of הִגַּדְתָּ, as in xxxi. 37. The latter view may be modified by regarding מִי as the object of the verbal sense in מִלִּין, rather than of the verb expressed; and that probably gives the reason of its being accompanied by אֶת, the sign of the object, used when there is something emphatic about it, or requiring to be peculiarly noticed. Or if taken directly with הגדת, it may be because the verb, in that case, has a double object (*whom dost thou speak words about?*) like the Greek *λέγειν τινά τι.* In many cases where the sense of *with* is given to אֶת, it simply denotes government, as in the frequent phrase, עָשָׂה חֶסֶד אֶת־פ, *did good with* (*or to*) *any one.* This may be better rendered *do one good* (*show him mercy*), exactly like the other Greek phrase, *δρᾶν τινά τι.*

[4] Ver. 4. **Hast thou declaimed.** This seemingly free rendering is given to הגדת מלין because the words, taken together, convey here just that idea. מלין is thus used for the more formal speeches (*sermones*) or speech-making, *sententious* and *showy.* The verb in its more primary sense of *holding forth* (*setting before*), making a show, contains the same idea. This is increased by the emphasis on מִי, taken with אֶת: *who is it, who is the Being you are making speeches about?* The reference is to Bildad's display in respect to the heavenly bodies, as Eliphaz, too, had done xxii. 12. These are patent glories; but the mind of Job is on the dark mysterious side of things, and, therefore, instead of looking up, he looks down, and calls attention, in the opposite direction, to the depths below, left only to the trembling imagination of man, but as visible to God as any of the upper splendor that strikes our eye.

5 Where[5] groan the giant[6] shades,
Beneath the waters and their habitants,—
6 All bare before Him lies the Underworld,
And deep Abaddon[7] hath no covering.
7 High o'er the Void, He stretcheth out the[8] North;
And over[9] nothing hangs the world[10] in space.
8 He binds the waters in his cloud;
Nor is it rent beneath their weight.
9 He closes[11] firm the presence of His throne,
And o'er it spreads His cloud.
10 A circle[12] marks He on the water's face,
Unto the bound where light with darkness blends.
11 Heaven's pillars rock;[13]
They stand aghast at His[14] rebuke.
12 So by His strength He quells[15] the [raging] sea,
And by His wisdom smites its threatening down.
13 By His spirit hath He made the heavens fair;[16]
The serpent swift (on high) His hand hath formed.

[5] Ver. 5. **Where.** This word of place is necessary as connected with the declaration ver. 6. See EXCURSUS VI., pa. 189.

[6] Ver. 5. **Giant shades.** See Exc. VI., pa. 189

[7] Ver. 6. **Deep Abaddon.** See Exc. VI., pa. 189.

[8] Ver. 7. **Stretcheth out the north.** See Exc. VI., pa. 189.

[9] [10] Ver. 7. **Over nothing—world in space.** See Exc. VI., pa. 189.

[11] Ver. 9. **He closes firm.** מְאַחֵז, *maketh fast. Shutting* is only a secondary sense as used in Kal. Neh. vii. 3; but there it more properly means *holding tight* the gate after it is *shut;* the shutting being expressed by another word. The best places to determine its meaning here are 1 Kings vi. 6, where it is used of the building of Solomon's house, and 2 Chron. ix. 18, where, as here, it is connected with the building of a throne. The Piel here is simply intensive of Kal. It never loses its primary sense, and therefore *firmly closing*, as by a *ceiling* or a *bar*, would be better than DELITZSCH'S "*enshrouding*," which makes, moreover, a mere tautology of the second clause. It may be a question whether *strengthening* or *firmly maintaining* is not the sense here, rather than *shutting*. Thus regarded, the verse would be nearly parallel to Ps. xcvii. 2: "Clouds and darkness are round about Him; but Justice and Truth are the establishment of his throne." פְּנֵי כִסֵּה, *the face of the throne*, would be the אוּלָם, the vestibule or porch of the throne regarded as a large structure (עַל פְּנֵי הֵיכַל) as described 1 Kings vi. 3.

[12] Ver. 10. **A circle.** This is simply phenomenal, or *optical*, rather. It sets forth the visible horizon though it may be taken to represent the earth's remotest limit. DELITZSCH makes too much of it. It has nothing to do with "the conception of the ancients that the earth is surrounded by the ocean, on the other side of which the region of darkness begins." That was an idea of the Mediterranean Greeks and Phœnicians, rather than of the desert-roving or inland Arabians.

[13] Ver. 11. **Heaven's pillars rock.** The word רוֹפֵף, Poel of רוּף, occurs only here, but it almost explains itself: *yerophaphu*. It expresses a rapid, vibratory, oscillating motion,—a quivering, like the Greek *ῥιπὴ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ*, phonetically similar, but having a different etymology. The "pillars of heaven" are the high mountains that present the optical appearance of holding up the heavens, as Atlas to those who sail on the African Atlantic; whence the Greek fable.

[14] Ver. 11. **At His rebuke.** His thunder-voice. UMBREIT says admirably: "We think on the heavy sounding thunder rolling on from mountain to mountain (den dumpf von Berg zu Berg fort rollenden Donner)." So Sinai shook, Ps. lxviii. 9; Jud. v. 4. Comp. also Ps. civ. 12: "He toucheth the mountains and they smoke." As expressive of this astonishment of nature at the presence of her Lord, see, moreover, Ps. cxiv. 5–7: "What ailed thee, O thou sea, that thou fleddest? thou Jordan that thou wast driven back? Ye *mountains* that ye skipped like rams, ye little hills, like lambs. Tremble thou earth (חוּלִי) at the presence of the Lord, at the presence of the God of Jacob."

[16] Ver. 12. **He quells.** EWALD, DELITZSCH, and ZÖCKLER, give רָגַע the opposite sense of *rouses up*, but the other is certainly more in accordance with the Hebrew usage (see Isaiah li. 15), as well as with the corresponding Arabic verb (*to return*). So in the second clause, they translate *Rahab* (רַהַב) as a proper name, and refer it to some supposed monster of the deep. The sense of *pride*, *threatening*, *rage*, or *strength* (Ps. xc. 10) which the word undoubtedly has, suits well the application to the sea, although, there is no pronoun: Smites down the threatening storm (מָחַץ smites it at one blow). This is the rendering of GESENIUS, UMBREIT, and CONANT. It is too, in the more perfect harmony with the parallelism, even if we regard Rahab as the sea monster, to render רָגַע as GESENIUS does. It would carry the idea of this mighty creature sporting in the storm, and struck down by the power that quells it. Comp. Ps. cvi. 9.

[16] Ver. 13. **The heavens fair.** By this rendering, which is that of UMBREIT and CONANT, the parallelism is better maintained than by any other. The transition is now from the stormy sea to the serene heavens. It is *first* to the heavens generally, or the brilliant nightly sky with its glorious array of constellations, and *secondly* to one particular constellation (*Serpens, or Draco*), of excelling interest and beauty. This constellation, from its striking and graceful appearance, is represented as the special work of God's hand, as the whole is of His creating, order-producing spirit (see Gen. i. 2). It is called the *swift* serpent (*fleeing, fugitive*) from its appearance of *gliding among* the stars and *twining*, as it were, around the North pole of the heavens. To one who looks at this very ancient figure, as it now shines in our northern nightly heavens, a very little imagination will call up the appearance that suggested this epithet to Job. חוֹלֵל, as the Poel of חוּל, has the generative or parturitive sense from the primary idea of *pain*, *travail*, or *struggle*, and thence transferred to production generally. When applied to God's creative *efforts*, if we may use the term, it seems to carry the idea of some mighty struggle with opposing forces; not literally, of course, but as indicative of the comparative greatness of the work (see Ps. xc. 2; Deut. xxxii. 18). The other rendering: *wounds*, *pierces* the Serpent (from חָלַל), makes an incongruous image, and drives to some far-fetched supposition like that which DELITZSCH gives, namely, God's piercing the Dragon who swallows up the sun in an eclipse (see also his comment on ch. iii. 5). The supposed parallelism, in that case, between the first and second clauses, would consist in the first mentioned *serenity* of the heavens, and the *restoration of their light* on the slaying of the sun-devouring dragon. With all respect, however, for so excellent a commentator as DELITZSCH, the opinion must

14 Lo, these, the endings[17] of His ways;
'Tis but a whisper[18] word we hear of Him;
His thunder-power, then, who can comprehend?

be expressed that this is extremely forced, besides being destructive of the exquisite harmony of the passage. It may be said, moreover, that this fable of the swallowing dragon, however it might suit the monster-loving Chinese, or Hindu imagination, is alien to the clear Shemitic mind. There is no proof of its having ever conceived any such thing. There is a difficulty in שִׁפְרָה, first clause. It cannot be the Piel (*make fair*), it is said, for the want of the Dagesh; but that objection is, by no means, insuperable. The gender also seems in the way, unless, as some think, ה is paragogic. This, however, may be resolved by the idea of an attraction between the verb and רוח, in ברוחו, which is in fact the more immediate agent; or it may be said to be demanded to make a more perfect parallelism with חֹלְלָה יָדוֹ in the second clause: if we may not rather regard יָד itself as the subject of שפרה, anticipated, as it were. By taking it, however, as a noun (*the heavens are beauty*), we get the same general idea, and, as some might think, more vividly expressed. There is some plausibility in the rendering "*by his breath* (*his wind*) he makes the heavens serene," as by a clearing up after a storm. This has in its favor its agreement with the previous verse, but it would impair the connection with the second clause. Another idea may be entertained, that by the serpent here is meant the ordinary serpent described by his ever *gliding* away, and then the parallelism might be said to consist of a contrast between the heavens, the great works of God, and one of the lowest things on earth. The astronomical idea, however, suits best with the spirit of the whole chapter.

[17] Ver. 14. **The endings of His ways.** The reference is to the works of nature, or rather to those of the greatest beauty and magnitude, such as are represented in the latter verses of this chapter. These phenomena, splendid as they are, are but "the ends of his ways,"—the lower ends. The great power stands back of them, or above them. It calls to mind a most impressive formula employed by the Arabian Schoolmen. Our present knowledge, or the knowledge of sense, they called *makateu 'lamure* (מקאטע אלאמורי), *the ends or off-cuttings of things—sectiones rerum*, (something, perhaps, like what Paul meant, 1 Cor. xiii. 9, 12, by "*knowing in part*," ἐκ μέρους). They compared it to the threads which stick out from the lower or wrong side of the tapestry which the great Artificer is weaving above—*exitus finales*, rerum (קצות) comparati cum telis quæ super jugo textorio divinæ voluntatis texuntur (see WILLMET *Arab. Lex.* 611). Even the brilliant heavens present to us the lower side, the wrong side of the carpet, as it were, in which the figures (the *ideas*) are dim and confused. How gloriously, then, must they stand out above, or to the mind that sees them from the higher plane!

[18] Ver. 14. **A whisper word.** Nature's "*still small voice*," קוֹל דְּמָמָה דַקָּה, 1 Kings xix. 12. **The thunder power,** or literally the *thunder of His power*, רַעַם גְּבוּרָתוֹ is that displayed in the great creations, or *creative days* (referred to in the theophanic Address, xxxviii. 4-12), when the Word went forth like "the seven thunders in the Apocalypse," or the great *days* of *renovation* referred to in Ps. cii. 27, and Isaiah lxv. 17: "Behold I create new Heavens, and a new earth." Or it may refer generally to the miraculous in the history of this world, or God's special dealings with it, in distinction from the orderly movements in the common course of things. See EXCURSUS on Ecclesiastes xi. 6, Lange Com. vol. x. p. 150.

CHAPTER XXVII.

1 Then Job again took up his chant and said.

2 As liveth God who turns[1] away my plea,—
The Almighty One who hath distressed my soul,—
3 So long[2] as breath remains to me,
And in my nostrils dwells Eloah's[3] life,—
4 These lips of mine shall never say the wrong,
My tongue shall never murmur[4] what is false.

[1] Ver. 2. **Turns away.** E. V. and others, "*takes away* my right," conveying the idea of an unjust decision. But Job cannot mean this. In the *first* place, the words will not bear it. They cannot here be carried beyond the idea of turning aside, or putting off. In the second place, the charge of an unjust decision would be inconsistent with the act of swearing by God, which implies that He is the sure support of *right*, as well as of *truth*—the ground of confidence. God's people are represented as those who swear by his name, Deut. vi. 13, וּבִשְׁמוֹ תִּשָּׁבֵעַ, Isai. lxv. 16, "shall swear by the God of truth and justice," בֵּאלֹהֵי אָמֵן. Isai. xlviii. 1; Ps. lxiii. 12: "Let every one rejoice that sweareth by Him." There is, therefore, weight in the remark that RASCHI quotes from Rabbi Joshua, that "Job must have served God from love, because no one swears by the life of the king (בחיי המלך) unless he loves the king."

[2] Ver. 3. **So long as.** DELITZSCH and ZÖCKLER, with others, take the 3d and 4th verses as a parenthesis, and bring the force of the oath on the 5th. The reasons they give will not hold. SCHLOTTMANN goes with the old expositors, and gives substantially the rendering here adopted, which is that of E. V., LUTHER and CONANT. For כִּי after verbs of swearing, see 1 Sam. xxi. 16; 2 Chron. xviii. 13.

[3] Ver. 3. **Eloah's life.** רוּחַ here evidently denotes something more than נְשָׁמָה in the first clause: *The breath of life*, in distinction from the mere respiration. *Eloah's life*, the life that Eloah has given. Comp. Gen. vi. 3, רוּחִי, "my spirit," the spirit *or life* that I have given man. Comp. Ecclesiastes xii. 7.

[4] Ver. 4. **Murmur.** The Hebrew הגה is frequently rendered *to meditate;* but this is only a secondary sense. The primary idea is that of a low muttering, or *murmuring* voice, as when one is reading to himself. A contrast of diminution is evidently intended here, and our word *murmuring*, in its primary sense of a low sound (not that of complaining), is the best our language affords for its expression: shall not *speak* it—shall not even breathe or *murmur* such a thing.

5 Away[5] the thought; I'll not confess[6] to you;
Nor mine integrity, until my latest breath,[7] renounce.
6 My right I hold;[8] I will not let it go;
My heart shall not reproach me[9] while I live.
7 Mine enemy; be he the wicked one;
And mine accuser,[10]—he the unjust.
8 For what the false[11] man's hope that he should[12] gain,
When once Eloah redemands[13] his soul?
9 Will God regard his cry
When trouble comes?

[5] Ver. 5. **Away the thought.** חָלִילָה לִּי: *Profanum.* As used thus, it is a kind of interjection expressing the utmost abhorrence: O profane! O abomination!—*procul absit.*

[6] Ver. 5. **I'll not confess.** אַצְדִּיק אֶתְכֶם, *Admit you to be in the right.*

[7] Ver. 5. **Latest breath.** Literally, *until I gasp*, עַד אֶגְוָע, *adh eghwah*, an onomatopic word.

[8] Ver. 6. On the omission of conjunctions, see Note xiv. 2.

[9] Ver. 6. **My heart shall not reproach me.** RENAN: Mon cœur ne me reproche pas un seul de mes jours. So DELITZSCH: *My* heart reproacheth not any one of my days. This may do if we take מ in מִיָּמָי in its partitive sense: *any one of my days.* But the other view which regards the expression as denoting *the time how long* is easier and saves a difficulty. The reader sympathizes with Job's general vindication of himself; but the assertion that nothing to cause self-reproach had ever occurred in any single day of his life is extravagant and repelling.

[10] Ver. 7. **Mine accuser.** Literally, *one who riseth up against me*—his adversary in the litigation. This idea is in the Hithpoel מתקומם, like the Greek Middle participle ὁ καταδικαζόμενος. It is not an imprecation, nor even a harsh wish, personally, except so far as it affords a vehement way of repelling the charge from himself. It simply means: if he cannot make it out, then *he* is the wicked man, *he* the unjust.

[11] Ver. 8. **The false man.** Such a one as they would make Job to be, and such a one as he would truly be, should he make a false confession. GESENIUS gives to חָנֵף the general sense of profane, impious, impure, which is almost the direct contrary of the Arabic חניף. Most of the later commentators follow this. The old rendering *hypocrite*, however, is almost everywhere used by E. V., and the idea of *falseness* of some kind, which the context generally connects with the word, gives it countenance, especially in such a place as this. It furnishes, too, a better ground of agreement with the Arabic sense of devotee, which might easily come from it, or give rise to it, by that reverse association which has great influence in language.

[12] Ver. 8. **That he should gain.** This corresponds to the old versions, to the Syriac especially, and, in general, to the views of the older commentators. The rendering, *when He cutteth off*, given to the Kal יִבְצָע (DELITZSCH, ZÖCKLER, UMBREIT and others), is presented with great confidence; but there are to it very serious objections. 1. It makes, in fact, an intervening clause, to which, however short, the accents ought to have conformed. 2. It gives one subject (God) to two verbs, in two separate clauses, each beginning, unnecessarily, with the particle כִּי—a thing certainly very unusual, if not unexampled in Hebrew. The rarity of such a construction seems admitted in the fact that DELITZSCH can only cite two cases: Job xx. 19; Neh. iii. 20. But a careful examination of those places shows very essential differences, rendering them quite inapplicable here. In both, the verbs are preterites, and follow each other immediately in the same clause. What is still more important, in each example the first verb is evidently used as adverbially qualificative of the other. Thus xx. 19, רִצַּץ עָזַב, "he hath *crushed*, he hath *forsaken* the poor:" he hath cruelly forsaken after crushing, or in crushing. The two make one complex act, the first heightening the effect of the other. The example, Neh. iii. 20, is still more clear. It is a graphic picture of the builders of the walls of Jerusalem, each one earnestly engaged in his separate work: "After him Bazuk, the son of Zabbai, הֶחֱרָה הֶחֱזִיק, *he was zealous, he strengthened;*" that is, he *zealously strengthened;* as in other cases where one verb is qualificative of another. 3. It would make a feeble repetition, besides changing the figure: "*cut off—draw out* his soul." 4. It destroys the parallelism, as it breaks the clauses. The other view is very easy and natural, besides most perfectly preserving the parallelism and the harmony of contrasted ideas. It is certain that בצע in Kal has this sense of *gaining, gathering wealth*, though coming from the sense of seizing plundering, in a word, of *rapine* (*rapuit*); that, too, derived from the still more primary sense of *cutting.* The pure primary sense, however, is quite rare, and is mainly confined to the Piel, though even there the sense of *rapine* is predominant. The idea of *gaining* wealth by violent means is the most common, especially in Kal, and as it appears in the noun בֶּצַע, which comes to mean *gain acquired in any way.* In Job vi. 9, we have the Piel with the sense of carrying or taking away. Had it been Piel here, it would have been more favorable to the view of DELITZSCH; and it is not easy to see why, if such had been the intended meaning, there should have been used another form more commonly associated with the other idea. RASCHI gives the same idea as we have in E. V. He renders it by גָּזַל to plunder (when he hath plundered). This, too, has the primary sense of *excision*, and gives the same play of words, or rather of ideas, which is one of the elements of the parallelism: the *rapine* of the wicked man (his evil gain) and his own *raptus* or *carrying off*, when death makes a *prey* of him. DR. CONANT aims at preserving this in his translation, whilst preserving also the old idea. The rendering above given calls up the picture drawn by our Saviour, Luke xii. 20, of the rich man congratulating himself upon his *gains* at the very time when his soul is required of him, or literally when they demand back his soul (ἀπαιτοῦσι); "then whose shall those things be," *etc.* The rendering which this demands for the first כי is certainly its most usual and natural one before a future: תקוה כי יבצע, "hope *that* he shall gain," or may gain. In the next clause, where this connection ceases, it has the other and very frequent rendering of *when*, which is both temporal and causal. There is no difficulty about this. כי connects as *motive*, as *reason*, or as occasion: *that—for or because—when.* All these uses come from its original pronominal sense, and are analogous to the two senses of ὅτι in Greek (*that* and *because*), and to the closely allied ὅτε (*when*), all of which flow out of the pronoun like the double sense of *quod* in La in (*that* and *because*, also *quum when*, neuter of old form *quus* for *qui*), and the similar double use of *that* in English.

[13] Ver. 8. **Re-demand.** Great difficulty is found with יֵשֶׁל, which cannot be made, grammatically, from נשל, nor from שלל, whilst the attempt to derive it from שלה fails to give any suitable sense, unless we borrow it from a similar Arabic verb, as GESENIUS and others do for this occasion. They would thus render it *draws out* his soul, as from the body its sheath—a conception having little warrant in the Hebrew psychology, and only a seeming one—as connected with a totally different word—in the Chaldaic of Daniel vii. 15. If, however, the Arabic is to be resorted to, then is there a very strong warrant for SCHNURRER's view, which GESENIUS says "is not to be contemned." Regarding it as pure Hebrew in sense and etymology, he would treat it as taking a form prevailing in the corresponding Arabic word. Thus it would be from שאל, to *ask, demand*, or יֵשֶׁל abbreviated for יִשְׁאַל with a falling out of the weak א, and the vowel of the preformative lengthened by the usual law of compensation. In Arabic the abbreviation comes from

10 Is he the man who in the Almighty[14] joys?
Or who at all times on Eloah calls?

11 I'll teach you now by God's own hand;
His dealings[15] I will not keep back from you.
12 Behold, ye all have seen the[16] sight;
Why then speak ye such utter vanity?

13 This is the bad man's dole assigned[17] by God,
The robber's heritage from Shaddai's hand:
14 'Tis for the sword his children multiply;
His offspring are not satisfied with bread.
15 Those that remain are buried[18] all in death;
His widows[19] do not weep.
16 Though silver like the dust he heaps,
And raiment common as the clay[20] provides;
17 He may prepare, the just shall put it on;
His treasures shall the innocent divide.
18 His house he buildeth like[21] the moth.
Or like the vineyard booth the watcher makes.
19 Rich[22] lies he down, never to sleep[23] again;

the trite use of the word. The same reason would have force in the Hebrew, and is, moreover, strengthened by the fact of cases where this weak א is actually lost in the derivative noun, as in שֵׁלָה for שְׁאֵלָה, 1 Sam. i. 17. Such a rendering, *demands* or *re-demands* (ἀπαιτεῖ), would make perfect the parallelism which is felt to exist between this and Luke xii. 20, before cited: *τὴν ψυχήν σου ἀπαιτοῦσι*. "*they* will demand thy soul of thee;" although there, instead of God, the subject is plural—the evil agents whom He permits to carry away the avaricious man's soul. MERX is often very extravagant in his treatment of the text; but here he keeps the usual reading, and is very happy in his rendering, especially of this second clause:

Was hat der Lästrer denn zu hoffen, wenn er raubt,
Und wenn sein Leben durch den Fluch gefordert wird?

[14] Ver. 10. **Is he the man?** The rendering in the future (E. V.), "*will he* delight himself?" instead of the indefinite present, mars the force of the passage as descriptive of character. Job contrasts such a man and his probable doings with his own well known religious life. It is not to boast of it, but to repel the idea of his being such an evildoer as their charges would make him. They had no proof of them, and, therefore, they were bound to take his character for piety, so well known throughout the East, as evidence that he could not be guilty of such sins. His life of prayer was opposed to it, especially what is recorded, i. 5, of his continual supplications, and his offering of sacrifice for his children when exposed to temptation in their hours of feasting. "How does this suit the man you have repeatedly described? Will he take delight in the Almighty? Will he be earnest and constant in prayer?"

[15] Ver. 11. **His dealings.** Literally, "the things that are with the Almighty." His peculiar dealings. The preposition עִם has been several times used to denote some special attribute or way. Comp. xii. 16: "*With Him* is strength and wisdom;" xv. 9; xxiii. 14: "Many such things are *with Him*." Job takes high ground here. He not only repels their charges, but assumes the position of their instructor. He has a wider experience than they possess, both of the ways of God and the ways of men. On the consistency of what follows as compared with former speeches of Job, see EXCURSUS III. of the ADDENDA, pa 183.

[16] Ver. 12. **Ye all have seen the sight.** This language, as DELITZSCH well observes, is of the highest importance in the interpretation of the rest of the chapter. You have seen the man, be says, as you have described him, and as I am about to describe him. You profess to be familiar with the case. Am I like him? Does my life, known to you, known to the world, carry those marks of the רָשָׁע that you are fond of setting forth? If not; if ye have no proof of any such thing, what utter falseness and absurdity in the application ye so repeatedly make of it to my case!

[17] Ver. 13. Literally *with God*, עִם אֵל: in the course of His dealings. See Note 15, ver. 11.

[18] Ver. 15. **Buried in death.** Unnecessary trouble has been given by this phrase, as here occurring. BÖTTCHER, quoted by DELITZSCH, regards מָוֶת here as denoting pestilence, as it seems to do, Jer. xv. 2; xviii. 21; and so DELITZSCH himself takes it, whom ZÖCKLER follows. OLSHAUSEN and DE WETTE would draw back the negative from the second clause, or supply it here by way of correction: *not buried*, that is, *left unburied* in death. May it not be simply a kind of summing up: They are slain by the *sword*, by *famine, etc.*, and these miserable remnants that escape such violent ends are all somehow buried in death, whatever may be the manner of it.

[19] Ver. 15. **His widows.** *etc.* The same Ps. lxxviii. 64.

[20] Ver. 16. **Like the dust—like the clay**—comparisons, not of *quality*, but of *quantity* merely.

[21] Ver. 18. **Like the moth.** Not as the moth builds, but frail as the moth—same comparison iv. 19. **The watchers' booth.** A transient, temporary hut for the watchman of the vineyard. See Isai. i. 8.

[22] Ver. 19. **Rich lies he down.** Not *the rich man;* for that would seem to denote another character introduced. עָשִׁיר is not a new subject, but a descriptive epithet.

[23] Ver. 19. **Never to sleep again.** In order to get the rendering there must be a different pointing יאסף, making it יֹאסִף (= יוֹסִיף) instead of יֵאָסֵף, out of which it is difficult to get any meaning. Literally, then, it would be: he lies down, and *adds not*," that is, never does it again. This is adopted now by the best commentators, and the chief authority for it is the LXX. version: *οὐ προσθήσει*, which, in such a case, is good testimony for the supposed ancient vowel reading to which it corresponds, however little its authority, in general as a translation. The far more accurate Syriac translation here has also ולא נוסף למקם, *and he shall not again arise*, being sufficiently variant from the LXX. to show that it was independent of it. Like the images in the next clause, and in the next verse, the whole language denotes his sudden taking off.

Once opens[24] he the eye, and is no more.
20 Terrors o'ertake[25] him like a flood;
A tempest steals him in the night away.
21 The east wind lifts him up, and he is gone.
Tornado like,[26] it hurls him from his place.
22 God sends (his bolt)[27] upon him—spares him not;
Though gladly from His hand would he escape.
23 Men clap their hands at him;
At sight of his abode[28] they hiss in scorn.

[24] Ver. 19. **Once opens he the eye.** One glance, one look, and he is gone. Or as RENAN gives it:

Il s'est endormi opulent; mais c'est pour la derniere-fois!
Il ouvre les yeux, il n'est plus.

[25] Ver. 20. **Terrors o'ertake him.** The image of a pursuit and capture; "terrors *catch* him." It is like the Greek idea of the chase of the Furies. ÆSCH. *Eumenides*, 130, 140,—

—λάβε, λάβε, λάβε, λάβε—
᾿Εγειρ', ἔγειρε καὶ σὺ τήνδ', ἐγὼ δὲ σέ.

Steals him in the night away. Comp. xxxvi. 20.

[26] Ver. 21. **Tornado like.** The Hebrew word is a very strong one, and the Piel form adds greatly to its intensity. It gets its verbal sense here from the noun שְׂעָרָה. Literally, *it storms, or hurricanes him.* Comp. Dan. xi. 40, and the cognate סַעַר, Hab. iii. 14.

[27] Ver. 22. (**His bolt**). God is doubtless the subject of the verb וישלך. The near or direct object is unexpressed, because, so easily implied in such a connection, like βέλος in Greek. It is the thunderbolt which Greeks and Latins, as well as the Hebrews, regarded as the peculiar weapon of the supreme Deity. Comp. xxxvi. 32, 33: "*His* thunder tells of Him."

[28] Ver. 23. **At sight of his abode.** Literally, *from his place.* But the translation of E. V., which is nearly that of EWALD, DELITZSCH, and ZÖCKLER, may give a wrong idea: *Hiss him out of his place,* as though that were a means of driving him *away from his place.* But this had been already done by the tempest, and by God's bolt. מִמְּקֹמוֹ can, therefore, only denote the position of the hisser. When men come to the place where he once lived, they hiss in scorn. It might be given in English by changing the order: *from his place they hiss.* This, however, being liable to ambiguity, the translator has adopted the fuller rendering of the VULGATE: *et sibilabit super illum* intuens locum ejus. The Hebrew is secure from ambiguity by reason of the preposition in עָלֵימוֹ (hiss *at* him), which translators seem strangely to have neglected. It is not likely that Job meant this as a general description of the wicked man's doom, any more than he intended some, or any, of his seemingly opposite pictures, for universal application. It has the look of being a marked case of sudden and overwhelming downfall, which he had himself known of, and which was probably notorious to the friends, as we may gather from his language, v. 12:

Behold ye all have seen the sight.

It had made a great impression upon all minds as a striking example of both Divine and popular vengeance. Job shows by it that his experience, in such matters, was not limited, and that, after all, there was a substantial agreement in their views, although he denounces their applications to himself as utter vanity, ver. 12.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

1 Yes[1]—truly—for the silver there's a vein,
A place for gold which they refine.
2 The iron from the dust is brought,
And copper from the[2] molten ore.
3 To (nature's) darkness man[3] is setting[4] bounds;
Unto the end[5] he searcheth[6] every thing,—
The stones of[7] darkness and the shade of death.

[1] Ver. 1. **Yes, truly.** A musing pause is to be supposed between this and the abrupt end of the previous chapter. The probable cause of such unexpressed thinking, very rapid it may be, is attempted to be traced in EXCURSUS V., pa. 186, which see. The particle כִּי is the connecting confirmation of the passing thought or emotion (taking form) which makes the transition, and with which the speaker breaks silence, as one who had been thinking aloud, as it were, or as though it were something known to those with whom he speaks, or which they would immediately apprehend.

[2] Ver. 2. **The molten ore.** More literally, *the ore molten becomes copper.*

[3] Ver. 3 **Man.** In the Hebrew the verb has only the pronominal subject: *He puts an end.* Most commentators, however, regard man as the subject, and the context forces to it.

[4] Ver. 3. **Setting bounds.** Literally, *puts an end,* that is, he throws the dark border farther and farther back, extends the horizon of knowledge. The imagery suggests that of xxvi. 10.

[5] Ver. 3. **Unto the end.** תַּכְלִית taken adverbially. The rendering is that of DR. CONANT.

[6] Ver. 3. **Searcheth.** (חוֹקֵר), or, *is the explorer*, taken as a noun. This shows that man is the subject above, as it would not be in harmony with the idea of God. The participle is to be carried all through the verses following, and should be expressed where there is no specifying verb. It is not adding to the translation, but a filling up; whether the singular or the plural number be required.

[7] Ver. 3. **Stones of darkness,** *etc.:* אֶבֶן, taken collectively. The ores hidden in the earth, and conceived as

4 Breaks from the settler's[8] view the deep ravine;
And there, forgotten[9] of the foot-worn path,
They let them down[10],—from men they roam afar.
5 Earth's surface (they explore) whence comes forth bread,—
Its lowest depths, where it seems[11] turned to fire;
6 Its stones the place[12] of sapphire gems,
Where lie the glebes of gold.
7 A path[13] the bird of prey hath never known,
Nor on it glanced the vulture's piercing sight,
8 Where the wild beast hath never trod,
Nor roaring schachal[14] ever passed it by.
9 Against the granite[15] sends he forth his hand;
He overturns[16] the mountains from their base.
10 He cutteth channels in the rocks;
His eye beholdeth every precious thing.
11 From weeping bindeth he the streams,[17]
The deeply hidden brings he forth to light.

12 But Wisdom,—where shall it be found?
And where the place of clear intelligence?[18]

lying near Tzalmaveth or the confines of the underworld (the *terra umbrarum*).

[8] Ver. 4. **Settler's.** The word is a modern one, and yet seems to give the idea here. גָּר is rendered *inhabitant*, but it means rather a *resident*, a *dweller* merely, as distinguished from a *born native*. גֵּר is rendered *stranger pilgrim*, one away from home; but in fact the two words are nearly the same. One of them is used to define the other, as in Leviticus xvii. 12, הַגֵּר הַגָּר בְּתוֹכְכֶם, "*the stranger that sojourneth in the midst of you.*" The idea here, as colored by the context, seems to be that of one dwelling in a remote region, the last inhabitant, in fact, on the very frontier of this wild mining district. If so our word pioneer, or *settler* would convey just that idea of remoteness required, and the double preposition, מֵעִם, would intensify the meaning (*from with*, from his society, to the desert wild). From this last border of civilization they go, *letting themselves down* the precipices, *lost to the beaten road*, and far away in the trackless solitude. The description, though very abrupt and concise, suggests almost literally the similar language with which ÆSCHYLUS describes the wild Caucasian region.

Χθονὸς μὲν εἰς τηλουρὸν ἥκομεν πέδον,
Σκύθην ἐς οἶμον ἄβατον εἰς ἐρημίαν.
—πρὸς πέτραις
ὑψηλοκρήμνοις—
τῷδ' ἀπανθρώπῳ πάγῳ.

"A frontier land—an untrodden desert—high beetling rocks—a craggy region far from human haunts." On the words נַחַל פֶּרֶץ and נַחַל, and the differing interpretations given to them, see EXCURSUS VIII., pa. 199.

[9] Ver. 4. **Forgotten of the foot.** רֶגֶל denotes here a well trodden, well-known way. To this *they are lost*, if we may take the Niphal participle deponently; but the literal passive is far more poetical. Instead of their having lost their way, or wandered from it, the way itself is personified as having forgotten them. It is in accordance with such expressions as we have, Job vii. 10; Ps. ciii. 16; "the place thereof knoweth it no more."

[10] Ver. 4. **They let them down** (*themselves down*), by ropes, or other means from the precipices: דַּלִּיג=דָּלַג. On this see EXCURSUS VIII., pa. 199.

[11] Ver. 5. **Seems turned to fire.** See EXCURSUS VIII., pa. 199.

[12] Ver. 6. **Place of sapphires;** near this region of fire or affected by it. There may be here, perhaps, some idea of sapphires and other precious stones being the product of fire,—*pyritic, pyrogenous;* or, in some way, of a fiery formation. See EXC. VIII., pa. 201.

[13] Ver. 7. **A path.** *The place where* or *whither*, for all these researches preceding it; or it may be confined to what follows, to the 12th verse. Or it may denote, generally, the scene of every thing narrated or described from the נַחַל, the entering valley, wady, or ravine, ver. 4. Such a view would be conclusive against the idea of its meaning the narrow *shaft of a mine*. The eagle's glance, the vulture's eye, the wild beast's tread, suggest something more than this. They give the thought of deep and dark places on the earth, difficult of access, indeed, but foreign to the idea of channels sunk under the earth. נָתִיב, a word of place, used as נַחַל is used, ver. 4, מָקוֹם ver. 6, and אֶרֶץ, ver. 5, "above."

[14] Ver. 8. **Roaring Schachal.** There are so many different names for lion in Hebrew, and especially in the book of Job, that it was thought best to transfer this, as has been done also iv. 10. The sense of *roaring*, which GESENIUS gives, is adopted, although founded on slender authority, from the Arabic. Still less satisfactory, however, is the other view, which would regard שַׁחַל as equal to שָׁחֹר, with a change of ר into ל, thus making it to mean *black lion*.

[15] Ver. 9. **Granite.** חַלָּמִישׁ rendered *flint*, Ps. cxiv. 8.—The hardest kind of rock; see Deut. viii. 15; xxxii. 13.

[16] Ver. 9. **Overturns.** On הָפַךְ as here used and as compared with Niphal, ver. 5, see EXC. VIII., pa. 201.

[17] Ver. 11. **The streams.** The word נְהָרוֹת is ever used of the larger kind of streams, and often of the mightiest rivers. It never denotes a mere *vein*, or trickling flow in the rocks, unless the sense be manufactured for it just to suit the supposed exigency of this place, as GESENIUS seems to do. The word alone is sufficient to show that the operations here described, from ver. 4 to 12, cannot be confined to so narrow a place as the artificial shaft of a mine. Though mining explorations do certainly form a chief part, yet the language gives rather the idea of extended wilds, precipices, inaccessible places, where they are carried on. What is said about the birds and the wild beasts shows this. The reference here, then, would rather be to the damming of large streams, so as to leave their channel dry for "prospecting" to use an Americanism. The poetical expression *weeping*, would have all its force when applied to the percolations from dams, as well as to the oozings from the rocky veins.

[18] Ver. 12. **Clear intelligence.** Our word understanding is hardly the right one here. It is too vague, and taken in too many different senses. The German *Einsicht* carries with it too much of the idea of mere *sagacity*, *skill*, as

13 A mortal knoweth not its price;
Among the living[19] is it never found.
14 The Deep[20] saith—" not in me;"
The Sea,—" it dwelleth[21] not with me."
15 For it the treasured[22] gold shall not be given,
Nor massive[23] silver for its price be weighed.
16 With Ophir bars it never can be bought;
Nor with the onyx, nor the sapphire gem.
17 The glass with gold adorned gives not its price,
Nor its exchange, the rarest jewelry.
18 Corals and crystals, name them not;
The wealth of Wisdom far excelleth pearls.

belonging mainly to natural knowledge, or the discernment of natural causalities. The true sense of בִּינָה, here, must correspond to that of חָכְמָה. Whatever that may be, as absolute truth, בִּינָה is the power of discerning it, the higher vision of the higher truth. ZÖCKLER makes the distinction to be between "wisdom in its *practical* aspect חָכְמָה, and its theoretical," בִּינָה; but that tells us nothing. If the חָכְמָה here set forth is above us, so is the בִּינָה; though something is gained when we understand that they differ as **truth,** and the *faculty* or power of discerning that truth. It is something which man has not in this life, as is most clearly expressed in the next verse. It is, however, an intelligence clear, unmistakable, not admitting the least doubt. The pronoun זֶה here, is simply emphatic; to render it by our demonstrative would overload the sense.

[19] Ver. 13. **Among the living.** Lit.: *in the land of the living.* This wisdom is unknown to men in this life. No declaration can be clearer, and it is one of the utmost importance in the interpretation of this wonderful chapter. It is confirmed in ver. 21, *hidden from the eyes of all living,*—of all living in the present state. In the other world, or in Death and Abaddon, as distinguished from "the land of the living," there first begins to be heard a rumor, a whisper of it. Whatever may be that state of being, it is then that the great secret of God, the great end for which He made the world and man, begins to disclose itself. Something is learned about it after death, which no amount of natural knowledge, or of human science, can give us here; whether it be the science of Bildad, or of Ptolemy, or of Laplace, or of a thousand years hence. Such merely natural knowledge never has, it never will, shed one single ray of light on the great question of questions. The utmost knowledge of the physical world can only give us the *how;* and even there, in its own natural department, the darkness and the mystery grow faster than any light it sheds. Nature itself is growing darker the more we study it. It presents more unsolved and unsolvable problems now than in the days of Pythagoras. Its study can never give us the *διὰ τί*, the *why*, the *reason* of nature itself. So Natural Theology may discover adaptations, designs terminating in nature, and that without end, but never the design of those designs. And that, perhaps, is the reason why what we call by that name has so little place in the Bible. For we are still in nature. It cannot take us out of it to the *wisdom* above, or to the world beyond, or to that remoter end to which the physical is only a means, and without which, or in the ignoring of which, it has neither a rational nor a moral value. Nature is but subordinate to a higher supernatural world. Science without this idea is leading us to atheism. It is darkening all minds except those who have, in some way, been taught. as from a higher plane, the solemn lesson conveyed in the close of this chapter, that the fear of God, faith in Him, and in His goodness, whether we can see it in nature or not, is, for man, his highest, and, in a comparative sense, his only wisdom.

[20] Ver 14. **The deep saith.** The Deep and the sea represent the physical world. They are put for its more unexplored recesses. It is a confirmation of the thought dwelt upon above. There could not be a more express way of saying: this great wisdom of God is not revealed in the physical world. The broad face of nature, its immensity, even its unsearchableness, proclaim His glory, His greatness, the existence of something immensely above man, and all conceivable being (see Ps. xix. 1; Rom. i. 20), but it reveals not the great secret of moral destinies; it answers not the question: "where shall wisdom be found?"

[21] Ver. 14. **It dwelleth not**. The second clause goes beyond the first. It has the asserting negative particle אֵין, giving a stronger emphasis to the declaration, and also the more intimate preposition עִמָּדִי—it is not *with me*—nowhere with me.

[22] Ver. 15. **Treasured gold:** so rendered from the etymological sense of סְגוֹר, something *shut up*, kept *secure* as very precious. The chief difficulty in rendering this splendid passage, arises from the number of names for gold. In respect to the other precious things, absolute correctness is not required to give the impression of great and incomparable value. Unless, however, we can get reliable diversities for these different names for gold, it is difficult to avoid tautologies, with their weakening effect, such as we know could not have been in the original. Gold is mentioned, in some way, four times. In our E. V. it is first simply gold, (ver. 15 סְגוֹר). Next, ver. 16, we have what is rendered "gold of Ophir," or *aurum* pretiosum, as GESENIUS very vaguely gives it. Etymologically it would be *stamp* of Ophir (כֶּתֶם אוֹפִיר, from a verb = כתב, and meaning *to mark, cut, etc.*). Hence the translator has rendered it *bars of Ophir*, or *Ophir bars*, as denoting gold uncoined, too precious for numismatical purposes,—bars with their value *marked* upon them. In ver. 17 there is a compound expression, זָהָב וּזְכוּכִית, rendered by E. V. *gold and crystals*, but by most commentators, and more correctly, perhaps, *gold and glass*. The difficulty with this, however, is two-fold: We have gold again unqualified, which looks like a coming down, and joined with it a substance, which, however rare and precious it may have been in early times, is now very common. If it be *gold and glass*, it must be some combination of the two, such as *aurated glass*, or *crystalline* (*glacial*) *gold*, expressing something once esteemed very rare and precious, but now unknown. The translator has here followed PAREAU, who renders it *vitrum auratum*, or *vitrum auro ornatum*, and makes a very good argument for the existence and preciousness of such an article. *Transparent gold* was thought of; but the other rendering appeared less hazardous. In verse 19, we have again the word כֶּתֶם (*mark, stamp*) as a name for gold, but joined with טָהוֹר the *pure*, the *unmixed*. Hence it was taken as a *superlative* expression, denoting the very highest degree of purity—gold in its עֶצֶם, or essence—gold without a particle of alloy of any kind, like the *χρυσίον πεπυρωμένον* of Rev. iii. 18,—the purest and most precious metallic substance, as a type of the spiritual wealth. For the most elaborate and satisfactory dissertation on the precious things mentioned in this chapter, there is recommended to the reader the work of PAREAU, *De Immortalitatis ac Vitæ Futuræ Notitiis ab Antiquissimo Jobi Scriptore adhibitis.* The latter half of the volume (pa. 229-367) is occupied with an exhaustive analysis of this remarkable chapter. According to the view taken, the fourth mention of gold, at the close of the long comparison, ver. 19th, is simply a confession that no conceivable earthly value makes even an approach to the worth of wisdom.

[23] Ver. 15. **Massive silver.** Silver being more common than gold, quantity enters the more into the estimate of its value. The epithet *massive*, therefore, only gives the emphasis implied in יִשָּׁקֵל the verb of *weighing*.

19 With it the topaz gem of Cush holds no compare
No stamp of purest gold can give its estimate.

20 But Wisdom,—whence, then, doth it come?
And where this place of clear intelligence?
21 So hidden from the eyes of all that live;
Veiled even to birds[24] (that gaze) from heaven's height?
22 Death[25] and Abaddon say:
"A rumor of it hath but reached our ears."
23 God understands its way;
HE knows its place.
24 For He to earth's remotest ends looks forth,
And under all the heavens, all beholds.
25 'Twas when He gave the wind[26] its weight,
And fixed the waters in their measurement;
26 When for the rain He made a[27] law,
A way[28] appointed for the thunder flash;

[24] Ver. 21. **Birds (that gaze).** They are taken as the symbol of the keenest intelligence, as they actually exhibit the highest perfection of mere *sense vision*, aided by the vast height to which some of them, especially birds of prey, as before mentioned ver. 7, rise in the air. The words in brackets only give the clearly implied idea. UMBREIT here, under a show of learning, utters a great deal of absurdity: "In the East," he says, "a deep knowledge and an extraordinary power of divination was ascribed to birds. They were regarded as intrusted with the interpretation of the Divine will. We are only to call to mind the personification of the good spirits of Ormuzd through the birds, as we find it in the Persian religion, or think of Simurg, the primeval king of the birds, who represented the highest wisdom, and who dwelt on the mountain Kaf, or of the bird language as set forth by FERIDEDD IN ATTAR, the great mystical poet of the Persians, *etc., etc.*" This is all rationalistic nonsense, or "the higher criticism" run mad. Such an idea of the birds' intimacy with the gods, in consequence of their apparent nearness to heaven, (towards which they seem to soar), very probably entered into all old systems of bird divination, whether in the East or in the West; but there is not the least trace of it in the Bible, and it has left no mark on the Shemitic languages, like *οἰωνός* (bird omen) in Greek, or *auspicium* (*aves specio*) in Latin. Especially preposterous is this idea of UMBREIT when viewed in relation to a theism so reverentially pure, as to make a pious man like Job actually jealous of the effect of the heavenly bodies, "the sun in its brightness, the moon walking in glory" (xxxi. 26), lest it might detract from what is due to "Him who setteth His glory above the heavens." There is no doubt, too, that *im Morgenlande*, or in some parts of it, there was a superstitious regard to precious stones. Certain gems were regarded as having magical or divining properties; and UMBREIT might just as well have made the same remark (*Man denke nur an*) in respect to Job's use of these in his comparisons of the value of Wisdom. The meaning, too, of the bird comparison is so obvious. The keenest sense vision, Job means to affirm, cannot discover it. What is this but saying that its perception does not belong to the sense world at all, even though sought by the keenest and most microscopic science, but to the sphere of things "*unseen and eternal*"—that world of supersensual being which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, (unless it be an ear that hath passed beyond the bounds of mortality, see ver. 22) nor hath it ever ascended in the heart of man" to conceive.

[25] Ver. 22. **Death and Abaddon.** Compare this with the 2d clause of ver. 13, and also with remarks on that verse in note 19. The language implies a bare whisper in respect to this ineffable wisdom,—a rumor, something *said about it*, and which first reaches the soul in that land beyond death, whether it be the region of the rest secure in Hades, or of the irrecoverably *lost* in Abaddon, "the bottomless pit," Rev. ix. 2.

[26] Ver. 25. **The wind its weight:** *The air* (*as* רוּחַ *might be rendered*) *its gravity*. The sublimity of Job is only lessened by studied attempts to find in it any of our modern scientific conceptions; but this is evidently selected from other parts of creation, as furnishing a wonder. The lightest of these known substances, or rather one which, to the common mind, was altogether imponderable, has a true weight assigned to it by God. Our Saviour speaks of this popular mysteriousness of the wind, John iii. 8, but He was comparing it with the higher mystery of the Spirit named after it in the necessary analogies of language. As a physical fact, however, the gravity of the wind, or air, needed no formal scientific teaching to bring it under the notice of that contemplative mind which regarded the earth (xxvi. 7) as resting in space, supported only "by the everlasting arms."

[27] Ver. 26. **A law (חֹק) for the rain.** Comp. xxxviii. 33; *the laws of the heavens*, Jerem. xxxiii. 25; *the laws of the heavens and the earth*; Jerem. xxxi. 35, *the laws of the moon and stars* חֻקֹּת יָרֵחַ וְכוֹכָבִים. The "law of the rain" here, according to ZÖCKLER, is simply the determining "*when* and *how often* it shall rain, and *when* it shall cease." We cannot help regarding this as an inadequate view of the language. Why should not the term be taken in a sense as high and as profound as any we attach to the modern term *law of nature*, as used by scientific men, or any others? The *idea* of law in nature is a different thing from a knowledge of the *details* of that law as they may be expressed in numbers, or in mathematical formulas. Law in nature, as an idea, may be defined to be *regulated sequence* with a uniform, and uniformly expected, recurrence, and this connected with the thought of a real nexus of causality distinct from the bare *fact-conception* of antecedence and consequence. The ancient mind had this. The Greek mind had it clear and distinct. Never has it been better defined than by Socrates when he speaks of it as "the harmony, the law, that holds together heaven and earth, and makes the universe a *κόσμος* instead of *ἀκοσμία* (see PLAT. Gorg. 508, A.) The Hebrew mind had it, as represented by David when he said (Ps. cxix. 89, 91): "All things stand according to Thine ordinance," "Thy word forever fixed in Heaven." The most important part of the idea, in fact, namely, that of a necessary *inherent causality* in distinction from the mere *fact of sequence*, some of our modern savans, and philosophers, have wholly discarded. They pride themselves in knowing a few more of the steps of causal fact, though but an infinitesimal part of the immeasurable road, but this, in fact, has a less intimate connection with the essential idea than the part which they have rejected as unknowable and *therefore* unreal. On the "Bible Idea of Law in Nature," see remarks, SPECIAL INTRODUCTION *to the First chapter of* GESENIUS, LANGE series, Vol. I, page 143. In this passage, there is no reason for doubting that, to a mind so contemplative as that of Job, to say nothing of any guiding inspiration, the thought, though formally undefined, was present in all its inherent power. It was not arbitrary; it was not mere sequence; he knew that there was "a law for the rain" extending to every link in its physical production. As respects the knowledge of the number of those links, he was a few inches behind a modern savan, but to the *inherent causation* the latter is no nearer,—he may, in fact, be farther from it,—than Job himself.

[28] Ver. 26. **A way.** Here, too, ZÖCKLER's conception seems inadequate. He renders דֶּרֶךְ, *a way*, a path, ein

27 'Twas then HE saw[29],—declared it [good],
And built it firm,[30] and made its[31] testings sure.

Bahn, which would do very well, were it not for his comment, namlich durch die Wolken, *through the clouds*. Poetically this is expressive, and is favored by the context xxxviii. 25, where the whole language is intended to be in the highest degree phenomenal. But here the train of contemplation which is produced by this description of the ineffable Wisdom seems to demand something more than the mere conception of a passage through the clouds. As חק *decree* (*primarily, mark, line, terminus*) may be taken for the inward law or *idea*, so דרך suggests, not so much the space way, or direction, as the phenomenal *order of causalities*. In this sense it is yet *a way* to science. More and more facts, or links, are constantly making themselves known, but they are only additional steps in *the way* of which Job speaks. This is not ascribing to Job any measure of what would be called science, or philosophy. It is a distinction belonging to the common thinking, to every contemplative mind in all ages. There is another scriptural term for law in nature which goes deeper than all. It is the word בְּרִית (*covenant*) as applied to nature; as in Jerem. xxxiii. 20, "My covenant of the day and my covenant of the night," the established order of time, of the seasons, of nature's courses. It is God's covenant with His rational beings, that they may trust nature, with its order of sequences established by Him for their moral benefit, or for ends higher than nature itself. It is appealed to as a kind of oath, confirming the constancy of His moral and spiritual purposes by the constancy He has established in the physical world: "If ye can annul My covenant of the day and of the night (see Gen. i. 14, 15; viii. 22; ix. 12–17) then may ye annul my covenant with David": The great promise of the Messiah and of His eternal kingdom, confirmed, as it is, by an oath, having for its pledge the constancy of nature. Here is a higher constancy. Here is an order of things in respect to which the dictum of the naturalist, asserting invariability, holds true. The moral and spiritual system can admit of no breaks, no suspensions or deviations in its eternal laws. For it all lower law was made.

[29] Ver. 27. **He saw,** רָאָה. There is a Masoretic note indicating another reading with Mappik רָאָהּ, *he saw it*, which ZÖCKLER adopts. It would seem a plausible emendation, until we think of the resemblance here suggested to the i. of Genesis, the repeated declaration as made with this same verb without a pronoun, וַיַּרְא אֱלֹהִים, *and God saw*, Gen. i., vers. 3, 10, 12, *etc.*, and especially the closing one ver. 31, "And God saw all that He had made, and lo it was good, very good." The word וַיְסַפְּרָהּ here: *and He declared it*, suggests the same great announcement, and, therefore, the translator has ventured to add the word in brackets. It might, however, be regarded as actually contained in the verb itself, which has the sense of *praising, celebrating*, as in Ps. xix. 1, where the response to Gen. i. 31 seems sent back: "the heavens are telling (מְסַפְּרִים) the glory of God"—the greatness and goodness of Him who pronounced them good, His glorious handiwork. The pronoun in וַיְסַפְּרָהּ must refer grammatically to חכמה, the ineffable Wisdom, but the more immediate reference must be taken as being made to these *works of Wisdom*, or the creation as its outward phenomenal representative. But the whole chapter is involved in a contradiction, unless a distinction is made between such manifestation of its effects, and the eternal Wisdom itself. Of this it cannot be said, *that sie kund*, as ZÖCKLER and UMBREIT translate, or *erzählte sie*, as others render it. The phenomenal representation (and so in some sense the thing itself as an ineffable fact) is *made known, narrated, reported*, but not so can it be said of the Wisdom itself, whose place is here so earnestly inquired after as something *hidden from all the living*, and of which the afterworld and underworld have barely heard a rumored whisper. Neither can Wisdom here be the Divine architectural *skill* in the construction of the world. It is not the wisdom shown in the adaptation of natural *means* to natural *ends*, such as that which forms the subject of natural science, and even of natural theology. It is not nature, or God's great skill in nature itself, or in utilitarian happiness-producing final causes, as they are called, but the great ineffable reason why nature, why man, why the world at all, was ever made. If it were natural knowledge, then it might be said that men like Newton, Laplace, and Faraday, made some advance in it, though infinitely small in comparison with the vast unknown. If it were any speculation about ideas, and an ideal world, then Pythagoras, and Plato, and Cudworth, might claim some standing there. But every thing of this kind is shut out in the most express terms. It is not a priori knowledge, or any rudiments of such knowledge, through which we may laudably inquire, though to a very feeble extent, *how* God made the worlds? It is not in nature at all, whether viewed a priori or inductively, and, therefore, through nature can it never be revealed.

> The deep saith—not in me;
> The sea—it dwelleth not with me.

These are evidently put for nature's most unexplored and inaccessible departments. Although, therefore, we cannot affirm what it *is*, or go beyond the fact of a mystery, ineffable, yet having a most intimate practical relation to the human moral destiny, yet this may be said, and every one who believes God's Word should fearlessly assert it, that the humblest Christian, the most ignorant man who has in his soul a true reverence for God, and a true hatred of sin, is nearer to this great secret of the Universe, even in the present life, than the proudest philosopher, the proudest man of science, who neither knows nor prizes such a state of soul.

[30] Ver. 27 **And built it firm,** הֱכִינָהּ. Here, too, the objective pronoun must be taken as referring to the phenomenal creation, though grammatically related to the Wisdom which it represents, or rather, for which it was made, (τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται—καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε, Coloss. i. 16, 17). ZÖCKLER interprets הֱכִינָהּ, and especially יְסַפְּרָהּ, above, as an "evolution of the everlasting Wisdom, or an unfolding of its contents before men and other rational beings, the whole creation being nothing else than such an Entfaltung and display of its adaptedness" (Vergeschichtlichung). But this certainly makes it, after all, only a knowledge of God in nature, or of His ways in nature, and seems to contradict the idea so expressly set forth in other verses of its being utterly unknown to men in the present life. It moreover buries all in nature, and leaves no moral end or moral world wholly above it,—the great heresy, and the source of all the irreligious positions of our modern science. There is found in a few manuscripts the reading הֱבִינָהּ, *he understood it*. It seems strange that it should have been adopted by EWALD, as it makes a barren repetition of what is said in ver. 23, besides being out of place in its relation to what follows. There is, moreover, lost by such a reading, another striking suggestion of the creative account. The supposition that this was known to Job traditionally or otherwise, and that there was some degree of familiarity even with its language, derives strong support from the Divine address xxxviii. 4, 13, where the resemblances are unmistakable. Here הכינה calls to mind the assertion וַיְהִי־כֵן repeated after every going forth of the Word. Each *originates* a new movement in the ascending scale of things, and then this formula is used (imperfectly rendered *and it was so*), as though merely giving the narrator's assurance that it actually took place. Even if we render כֵּן as an adverb, *so*, it does not lose its participle sense of *firmness, establishment, fixedness*,—it was so, and it *continued* so,—became כֵּן, *fixed, established*,—in other words, became *a nature* to remain such until suspended as God might see fit, or finally revoked when the great end for which nature was constituted, or the great Wisdom of God might, perhaps, dispense with nature altogether. So here the same root is used: הכינה, He *fixed it*—built it firm. The language loses none of its strength or sublimity by being thus anthropopathically rendered. He made it to stand till its end was answered.

[31] Ver. 27. **Its testings.** We certainly cannot render חקר here, as we would when used of man, as in ver. 3, or as E. V. has given it, and many others: *He searched it out*. It would not be applicable either to the creation, as the work, nor to the Wisdom as the pattern, unless taken anthropopathically, not in the sense of discovering the unknown, but of testing the work, or the model, when made. There is something of this kind of representation in the creation account itself. It is an emphatic mode of conveying to the finite mind a sense of its excellence and perfection. God appoints the heavenly bodies as denoters, among other things, of times and seasons. He is represented as *trying them*, putting them in the Heavens for that purpose. What right-feeling and right-thinking mind would lose the sublimity of all this for any assurance of scientific accuracy, which, after all, is no accuracy, for science is never finished. Again, God looks at the whole, as the maker would survey his machine

28 But[32] unto man He saith:
["Thy] wisdom; Lo, it is to fear the Lord;
To fly from evil, (thine) intelligence."

after he has set it in motion, and pronounces it admirable, שׁוֹב מְאֹד, καλὰ λίαν, *valde bona*—good—VERY GOOD. We would not think of charging PLATO with anthropopathism, when in a similar way he represents (Timæus 37, *c*) the great ζῶον, with its *animal* life, or plastic nature, as the subject of admiration to the "Generating Father," Πατὴρ ὁ γεννήσας, when he sees it move on in all its harmony and perfection. So God is said here to *test*, or try, the world He had made, to see if it answered that great *supra-mundane* end which is here called Wisdom, transcending all PLATO's ideas as much as it transcends our limited inductive science.

[32] Ver. 28. **Unto man.** Some would render לָאָדָם *of man:* So PAREAU, *de homine*, concerning man. The direct address, however, is the more common for the preposition ל. The other may be regarded as implied, and either view would justify the possessive pronoun placed in brackets. It is a special Wisdom for man, leading, at some time, to some glimpse of the great Wisdom. The distinction is demanded by the whole spirit of the chapter

CHAPTER XXIX.

1 Then again[1] Job lifted up his chant and said:

2 O that it were with me as in the moons of old;
As in the days when o'er me still Eloah watched;
3 When shone His[2] lamp above my head,
And when through darkness by His light I walked;
4 As in my autumn days;
When God's near presence[3] in my tent abode;
5 Whilst still the Almighty was my[4] stay;
Around me still my children[5] in their youth,
6 When with the flowing[6] milk my feet I bathed;
And streams of oil the rock poured forth for me.

[1] Ver. 1. **Then again,** וַיֹּסֶף. It certainly seems to indicate a pause of some kind; being said, not after the words of another, but in the course of Job's own speaking. It may have been a waiting for the friends to resume their argument. There is, however, no contradiction between the close of the xxviii., and the opening of the xxix. The under-current of thought can be easily traced, and yet the difference in style between this and the resumption demands the idea of some intervening silence, aside from this expression in the caption. In the xxviii. Job's thought of God's ineffable wisdom came from the contemplation of his own mysterious sufferings, bringing him to the grand conclusion that it is man's wisdom to believe and adore where he cannot understand. This high train of thought carries him, for a season, out of and above himself. Such a pitch, however, cannot be sustained, and so he comes down again to his own sorrows, his ever smarting pains, and that leads to the contemplation of former happiness which that same unsearchable wisdom had so bountifully conferred upon him. This is far from being an unnatural transition, although it is emotional rather than logical. It may be said, too, that the descent, if we may call it such, is all the more pathetic as thus succeeding a meditation so glorious and profound.

[2] Ver. 3. **When shone his lamp.** Lit.: *In its shining of his lamp*. The first suffix pronoun does not refer to God, as though the verb had a Hiphil sense: *in His making to shine.* Neither is it to be taken as DELITZSCH renders it: "*when He, when His lamp shone, etc*" It is the pleonastic use of the pronoun so common in Syriac, and if it were of much importance this might be called one of the Aramaisms of the book.

[3] Ver. 4. **Near presence.** סוֹד, *consessus, familiar intercourse.* See Ps. lv. 15; Job xix. 19. סוֹד יְהוָה, *God's favor.* The rendering of our translators, *the secret of God* is very happy, giving the idea of a heart intercourse unknown to others.

[4] Ver. 5. **My stay.** Lit.: *With me.* But עִמָּד always seems to have something more than its preposition sense. It denotes not only a very intimate communion, or a connection nearer and stronger than עִם, but also the idea of *constancy* (see its use ver. 20 and Note) *firmness, support,* as the context generally shows. So Ps. xxiii. 4, כִּי אַתָּה עִמָּדִי, "for Thou art *with me*, Thy rod and Thy staff they sustain me." It suggests the idea of the verb עָמַד to stand, as though עִמָּדִי meant my *stand by.* This is not without ground etymologically, although lexicographers regard it as only a strengthening of עִם by insertion of ד euphonic, a thing, however, which has no other example in Hebrew.

[5] Ver. 5. **My children in their youth.** נַעַר means simply a *youth*, either a *boy* or a *young man*, as in ver. 8. Some would render it here, *my servants*, because it is sometimes so used like *puer*, or παῖς, but that would destroy all the pathos. Still, if rendered *my children*, it needs the qualifying words. Job's children seem to have come to manhood at the time of his great bereavement, but he remembers them best in their tender age, when their presence was pure joy, or less mingled with anxiety, such as increased with their approach to adult manhood. The anticipated trouble to which he seems to allude, iii. 25, 26, had probably some connection with the fears that grew out of their older state, and which led to those touching acts of prayer and sacrifice mentioned, i. 5

[6] Ver. 6. **The flowing milk.** The epithet is needed here to give the proper emphasis, and, thereby, bring out the fair meaning which might, otherwise, be mistaken. This emphasis is on the words *milk* and *oil*, as both, from their smooth-flowing nature, suggestive of exuberance. It is not a mere effeminate luxury that Job has in mind. It is true that in the case of a rich man of old, possessed of vast flocks and herds, such a luxury as actually bathing the feet in milk would be neither incredible nor improbable. In the case of Job, however, we must take it as a hyperbolical expression figurative of great abundance, and not only that, but as something peculiar to him beyond others. This latter em-

7 When up the city's way, forth[7] from my gate, I went,
And in the place of concourse fixed my seat;
8 The young men saw me, and retired;
The elders rose—stood up.
9 The leaders checked their words;
And laid their hands upon their mouths.
10 The men of note, their voice was[8] hushed;
Their tongue suspended to the palate clave.

11 Then, too, there was an ear that heard[9] and blessed,
An eye that saw and testified,
12 That[10] I had saved the poor man when he cried,
The fatherless, the one who had no friend.
13 Thus on me came[11] the blessing of the lost;
The widow's heart I made to sing for joy.

14 I put[12] on justice,—it became my robe—
As mantle[13] and as diadem, my right.
15 Eyes to the blind was I—
Feet to the lame.

phasis is given by the strong preposition עִמָּדִי, which denotes something more than mere *adjacency*, as some take it, *the rock*, "*near Job*," or "in his neighborhood." It has a close personal sense: *with me* in distinction from others,—*in my case*, as something peculiar, or beyond the case of men generally. And this puts a still stronger emphasis on the substances mentioned. It was milk, in distinction from other fluids, in which the feet might be laved; or as though he intended to say, it was oil instead of water, the usual product of the rocky fountain, that the rock poured forth. Nature gave to Job her richest abundance. So UMBREIT seems to take it: Statt Wasser strömte der Fels Oel. See the same hyperbole Deut. xxxii. 13. הֲלִיכַי occurs only in this place. It is rendered *steps* by some, feet by *others*. UMBREIT admits that the feet are here intended, even though the rendering be *steps* or *goings*. And indeed the other makes a most extravagant idea—a walking or wading in milk. It is rather strange that this whole verse is omitted in the Syriac.

[7] Ver. 7. **Forth from my gate.** Does שַׁעַר here mean the gate of Job's dwelling or the gate of the city? It would seem that such places as Gen. xxxiv. 24, and Job xxxi. 34, ought to settle it. They can only mean the gate or door to the place of departure, or of one's abode. DELITZSCH, however, rejects it on the ground that "the place where Job dwelt in the country is to be thought of as without a gate." But private dwellings in the country may have had gates to protect them against marauding banditti, and this would be especially necessary in the case of a man of great wealth, like Job. The preposition עֲלֵי may be rendered simply *to*, but its etymology suggests the idea of *ascent*, *up to*. It may mean *position* merely, *by* the city; but that requires the supposition that שער is the city gate. The other is the more natural from the fact that a city, with its acropolis, was anciently built on the higher ground, as making, in that way, a better place of defence for its inhabitants, as well as for persons coming into it from without, and who, in time of peace, dwelt in the plain below.

[8] Ver. 10. **Was hushed.** Heb. *hidden*, that is, *suppressed*. For the plural form see ZÖCKLER. Vers. 8, 9 and 10 present a very concise yet most graphic picture of the effect produced by the sudden entrance into an assembly of one held in great and universal respect. Its simplicity, its air of truthfulness, and the pathos of its connection with his then state of extreme suffering, divest it of every appearance of vanity and boasting. The language gives the idea of one not in office, but living a most honorable private life. Job would have been called by the Greeks one of the καλοκάγαθοι, the good men and fair, *the good men and true*, who held no public station, but still, on that very account, possessed more true influence than the professional politician.

[9] Ver. 11. **And blessed.** UMBREIT *ruhmte mich*, made good report of me. This is very touching. In such assemblies there was not only the honor paid to him by the orators, and the leading men, but here and there some poor man's ear arrested by his voice, some eye that testified to acts of beneficence of which public fame made no report.

[10] Ver. 12. **That I had saved.** To render כִּי *for* or *because*, in this place, as most commentators do, seems greatly to mar the effect of the passage. It makes it a *reason*, and a somewhat boasting one, asserted by Job, instead of a testimony to the fact: *That* I had saved, *etc.* The latter view is not only in harmony with the more usual sense of כִּי as a connective (*quod*, ὅτι = *that* instead of *because*, see Note 12, ver. 8, ch. xxvii., pa. 113), but seems also demanded by the future following and denoting a *subjective succession* of event, or idea, dependent on a preceding governing word, such as תְּעִידֵנִי in this case. Thus Jerome in the VULGATE renders it *eo quod*, as dependent on *testimonium reddebat*. If כִּי denotes a reason independently, it is not easy to see why it should not have been followed by the præterite, or why אֲמַלֵּט, as it stands, should not be rendered in the future. It may be said that the *exigentia loci* demands the other sense, but if the view taken of כִּי be correct, then the *saving* is a *dependent* idea, and the word takes properly the Future, that is, the *Subjunctive* form. If it is an independent assertion, it is impossible to distinguish it from לָבַשְׁתִּי, ver. 14, below. כִּי has no conversive power except as it connects, not as a reason, but as an assertion of dependence on a preceding verb whose sense is incomplete without it.

[11] Ver. 13. **On me came.** The Future form of the verb תָּבֹא, is because of the train of thought being still under the influence of the recital, ver. 11. Though it may be regarded as grammatically independent of the כִּי, it still keeps the direction thereby given to it. So is it in respect to the 2d clause (אַרְנִן). It is all a part of that which made "the ear to bless and the eye to testify."

[12] Ver. 14. **I put on.** Here begins an entirely independent clause, and the assertion having no connection, either logical or grammatical, with what precedes, takes the preterite form לָבַשְׁתִּי. There is no tautology in the clause. The latter verb וַיִּלְבָּשֵׁנִי simply explains the figurative sense by the literal: yes, it did really *clothe me*—it became my *habit*—as the figure has become naturalized in English—*habitual to me*.

[13] Ver. 14 **Mantle and diadem.** These are not mentioned as ornaments, but as expressing the completeness of the clothing: From head to foot attired in righteousness.

16 A father to the poor;
The cause I knew[14] not, I would search[15] it out.

17 So would I break the fangs of evil[16] men,
And from their very teeth would dash the prey.
18 Then said I, "in my nest shall I expire,
And like the palm tree[17] multiply my days;
19 My root laid open to the water's breath,
And all night long the dew upon my branch;
20 My glory constant[18] with me—still renewed,
And in my hand my bow forever[19] green."

21 To me men listened—waited eagerly;
Were silent at my counseling.
22 After my word, they answered[20] not again;
For on them would my speech be dropping still.
23 Yes, they would wait as men do wait for[21] rain,
And open wide their mouths, as for the latter rain.
24 That I should mock[22] them they would not believe,
Nor make to fall the brightness of my face.

[14] Ver. 16. **Cause I knew not.** Some would render it, "the cause of one I knew not." It requires too great an ellipsis, a double ellipsis in fact. רִיב (אִישׁ) לֹא יָדַעְתִּי [ו] The rendering given implies the same and more. In the one case it would simply denote *impartiality;* the other and more literal rendering gives, in addition, that of carefulness to obtain a full knowledge of the case in order to be impartial.

[15] Ver. 16. **I would search it out.** אחקרהו is the *subjective* Future denoting *disposition*, and, in that way, habitual or repeated action, such as we denote by our auxiliary *would* (from *will*) which never loses its subjectively future idea: "I *would* do so and so;" it was my way. This is carried into the next verb at the beginning of the next verse, וָאֲשַׁבְּרָה; its ו, whether we call it conversive or not, giving it the exact time force of אחקרהו immediately preceding. The paragogic ending, however, gives it an optative as well as a subjunctive sense: "I would *desire* to break:" "I took pleasure in breaking the fangs of evil men."

[16] Ver. 17. **Evil men.** עַוָּל, taken collectively.

[17] Ver. 18. **Like the palm tree.** On the three interpretations of חול, in this verse, see EXCURSUS IX. pa. 206.

[18] Ver. 20. **With me.** עִמָּדִי. This seems to be a favorite preposition in Job's speeches. It is stronger than עִמִּי would have been: *My glory*, in distinction from that of others. It gives also the idea of permanence.

[19] Ver. 20. **Ever green.** תחליף, *regerminates.* It is the same word that is used of the tree, xiv. 7. See Ps. cii. 27; Isai. ix. 9; xl. 31; in Kal Ps. xc. 5, 6. The bow the emblem of vigor, strength, power. See Gen. xlix. 24.

[20] Ver. 22. **They answered not again.** The reason is given in the 2d clause, commonly rendered, *and my speech dropped upon them.* To regard ו, however, at the beginning of this second clause, as merely copulative, and thus denoting a subsequent speaking, would be an absurdity. By taking it as illative, that is, as connecting by way of giving a reason, we understand why they answered not. It was on account of the gentle and persuasive manner of his speech disinclining them to make reply. And this suggests another idea closely akin to it, and well deserving of notice as favored by the peculiar sense of נטף, "*distillation, gentle and repeated dropping, as of dew or rain.*" It may be taken as describing what may be called the musical effect of his works, the charm they possessed, as though still sounding on, or *distilling* in the souls of the hearers. UMBREIT gives a similar idea when he represents it as a spiritual influence: Meine Rede in ihrer Einwirkung auf die Herzen der Zuhörer war zu vergleichen mit dem auf den Erdboden träufelnden Regen. This is in harmony too with the tense form of תִּטֹּף, the *subjective* future, expressive of repeated *influence*, regarded as in the mind. The voice that charmed them seems still to prolong its tones, producing music in the soul, and there is a reluctance to destroy this effect by speaking again after its outward utterance had ceased. In this respect it suggests the striking passage Phædo 84, B. When Socrates closes his great argument on the Immortality of the soul as drawn from *Ideas*, the charm of his words still fills the ear, keeping them from speaking for some time, whilst each of the auditors is reluctant to break the silence. A similar effect is most poetically described in the Odyssey XI. 333, where Ulysses ends the long narrative of his wanderings, terminating with what he saw in Hades:

> *ὣς ἔφαθ' οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ,*
> *κηληθμῷ δ' ἔσχοντο κατὰ μέγαρα σκιόεντα:*
> He ceased to speak, and all, in silence hushed,
> Were held as by a rapture sounding on
> Amid the shadowy halls.

Κηληθμός, a soothing strain prolonged, still vibrating, undulating, throbbing. So נטף carries a similar idea of *dropping, distilling.*

[21] Ver. 23. **For rain.** An instance of subtile emotional transition. This mention of the rain is suggested by תטף in the preceding verse, or rather, the spiritual metaphor contained in it.

[22] Ver. 24. **That I should mock them.** See how the word שָׂחַק is used xii. 4, in the sense of mocking or scorning. There is no reason why it should not be so translated here. The rendering *smile*, in the sense of *favor, pity*, as DELITZSCH and some others would give it, has no example in the Scripture. שחק is used with אל or ל, and with עלי. The two first denote *laughing at*, in the sense of sport or mockery, the third carries the stronger idea of *laughing against*, that is, of scorn, or derision. There are only two places where it even seemingly varies from this. In Job v. 22, it might seem capable of the rendering *smile*, but it is the smile of contempt ("at destruction and at famine shalt thou laugh" or smile) not of favor or pity. So Prov. xxxi. 25, "she rejoices" (E. V.) "she laughs (CONANT) at the time to come." If rendered *smile* there, it is the smile of fearlessness. The stronger word *laugh* is according to the usage of the ancient world generally. They expressed all emotions of the kind, whether of grief or joy, by words and actions of a more violent nature than we exhibit. The sense of *smiling for fa-*

25 'Twas thus their way I chose,[23] and sat their head.
As king amidst the multitude[24] I dwelt,—
Among the mourners as a comforter.

vor, however, having no example whatever in Scripture, there is no need of dwelling on the rendering some give to לא יאמינו, in order to accommodate it to such a view. It is a mode of exegesis consisting simply in that easy resort of turning a clause from the apodosis to the protasis of a sentence, by supposing an ellipsis of the relative, which will only do when the context most clearly demands it. According to this DELITZSCH and ZÖCKLER would give the general idea to be: He smiles upon (favors, pities) *the despairing*—or "He smiles upon them in their hopelessness;" as though it were an ellipsis for אשר לא יאמינו. This, however, even if it could be tolerated by itself, only makes the next clause all the more difficult and unmeaning. See the efforts of DELITZSCH and others to make any sense out of it. The substance of it as given by EWALD, ZÖCKLER, and DELITZSCH is, that they did not make him cease to smile by their hopelessness. One can hardly look at the structure of the verse, however, without seeing that a strong contrast is intended which this treatment fails to give. The virtue which Job here claims for himself is that of gravity or dignity. Equally opposed to this, as they are to each other, is levity, whether in the form of frivolity, mockery, or derision, on the one side, or of petulance, moroseness, or anger, on the other. The meaning of the expression in the second clause would seem to be determined by Gen. iv. 5: in Kal, *to be angry*, as Cain was (ויפלו פניו, and his countenance fell); consequently, in Hiphil, *to make angry*, or to act angrily, as in Jerem. iii. 12, or to make sad, gloomy, morose. Men would not believe that Job could indulge in mockery or vain laughter; neither could they ever make him angry, or disturb the gravity of his countenance;—ever the same even, cheerful, dignified, God-fearing man.

[23] Ver. 25. **Their way I chose,** guided, directed, them in their way of life. **Sat as head:** as judge or arbiter among them; as in ver. 16.

[24] Ver. 25. **Amidst the multitude,** or crowd. גדוד is used oftenest of warlike bands, but to give it a military sense here, so as to make Job captain of a troop, or to render it as RENAN does,—

Je trônais comme un roi entouré de sa garde—

is not only preposterous in itself, but destroys one of the most touching contrasts in the chapter. Though גדוד is mostly used in a bad sense for a troop of banditti, or marauders (Hos. vii. 1; 1 Kings xi. 24; Gen. xlix. 19), yet there is nothing in the way of its meaning any large crowd or body of men, especially of a turbulent character. (UMBREIT, in dem Haufen). It would be the best Hebrew word to be found to designate a mob, whom the presence of such a man as Job would overawe by his very force of character. The expression *as a king* (כמלך), or, *as though a king*, is conclusive against the idea some have entertained that Job was in reality some kind of monarch or duke. He was that far higher thing, a holy, God-fearing man, known to be most just, whose very appearance struck with reverence and respect even a godless multitude, and made him, for a season, like a king among them. It is a picture that reminds us of one of Virgil's best comparisons: Æn. I. 148.

Ac veluti magno in populo cum sæpe coorta est
Seditio, sævitque animis ignobile vulgus;
Tum, pietate gravem ac meritis si forte virum quem
Conspexere, silent, arrectisque auribus astant.
Ille REGIT dictis animos.

That is he sits as REX. A strong contrast is evidently intended between what is expressed by גדוד (the turbulent assembly) and the hushed mourning circle, where Job appears in so different a capacity. The idea of EWALD and DILLMANN that in this language Job meant to give the three friends a kind of back-stroke for their failure to comfort him is unworthy of such excellent commentators, as it would be wholly at war with the impassioned earnestness of this most pathetic chapter.

CHAPTER XXX. [SCENE: *The Border of the Desert.* See EXC. X.]

1 And now they mock me; younger men than I,
Whose fathers I disdained,
To set them with the dogs that watched my flock.
2 For what to me *their* strength of hand,
In whom (the hope) of ripened manhood[1] fails?
3 Through want and hunger like the arid[2] rock,

[1] Ver. 2. **Ripened manhood.** כֶּלַח occurs only, here and in ver. 26; but there the comparison seems to fix its meaning: the *ripened* age, the *ripened* corn. It is not necessarily *old age*, though that well fits the first passage, but ripeness in general: so that it may be rendered here, manhood, mature age and strength, which these poor wrecks of humanity fail to reach. It has perished (אבד) in their youth, and hence they are unfit for any industrial service.

[2] Ver. 3. **Arid rock.** גַּלְמוּד. See Job iii. 7; xv. 34; Isai. xlix. 21 (where it has Patach in the first syllable, here only Segol). The primary idea is *hardness* (hence *barrenness*, Isai. xlix. 21). The Arabic word means *hard rock*, or *earth-pan*. It may be taken here as a collective noun-epithet: Want and hunger have made them rock—or like the rock, dry and hard; the particle of comparison in the concise language of poetry left out.

[3] Ver. 3. **Vagrants.** ערק, as a verb, occurs only here. It is quite common in the Syriac in the sense of *fleeing*. This it always has in the PESCHITO; as in Matth. ii. 13; "Flee into Egypt," iii. 7, "to flee from the wrath to come," Jas. iv. 7, "Resist Satan and he will flee." So also Mark xiv. 52; Acts vii. 29, and a large number of other places. So in the Old Testament PESCHITO (Zech. xi. 16, the only seeming exception, being a wrong reading for פרקו). The sense of gnawing is found in the Arabic, though there, too, it has the other meaning: *to roam through the land;* the *gnawing* sense being *secondary*, in some way of derivation, or most likely onomatopical, like the Hebrew חרק to grind the teeth, *hhrk*. In verse 17, the noun, or participle, עֹרְקַי, may be rendered *my gnawers*, and suits very well the context (*gnawing pains*); but there again we are met by the fact that the corresponding Arabic has the sense of *veins*, *arteries*, or *sinews*, such as our translators have given it. How it gets this we may not clearly know; although the conjecture may be hazarded that it has some connection with the idea of *fleeing* or *darting* pains, as they are called. See Note on that verse. It cannot be denied that in this place, the sense of "gnawing the desert," the "hard ground of the steppe," is very harsh and hyperbolical. In the sense of *fleeing*, as so

These vagrants[3] from the land of[4] drought—
Of old time[5] waste and wild,—
4 Who in the jungles pluck the acrid[6] herb;
The roots of juniper[7] their food.
5 From human concourse[8] are they driven forth;
Men shout against them as against a thief;
6 Within the gloomy gorge[9] their dwelling-place;
In holes of earth,[10] amid the hollow rocks.
7 Between the desert shrubs they bray;[11]
Under the brambles do they herd[12] like beasts.

8 Children of folly, sons[13] of nameless sires,
With scourgings[14] are they driven from the land.
9 And now their song have I become,
Their ribald word[15] of scorn.
10 They view me with abhorrence—stand aloof—
Yet from my face their spittle[16] hold not back.

common in the Syriac, the Chaldaic, and the later Rabbinic, it has the usual prepositions *to* and *from*. As joined here with צִיָּה, the latter meaning (*fleeing from*) is the easiest; since, in other languages, a verb of flight (when meaning *from*) often has the accusative directly without any preposition (as to flee the land), whilst the other ellipsis, when fleeing *to* is meant, is unexampled. It does not, therefore, mean, as our translators give it: "fleeing into the desert;" and that is a sufficient answer to DELITZSCH, who says "that the meaning *fugere* is tame, since the desert is the proper habitation of these people." There is nothing, however, opposed to the idea of their being driven in *from* the desert, on account of want, or of their *roaming* back and forth from their wild haunts to the borders of civilization, and to that the word *vagrants* is exactly adapted.

[4] Ver. 3. **Land of drought.** צִיָּה, simply means *aridity, drought*; as in Job xxiv. 19, from the root צָהָה. In Pss. lxx. 2: cvii. 35, אֶרֶץ is joined with it. Here it stands for the place—the desert.

[5] Ver. 3. **Of old time.** אֶמֶשׁ. Some render this word *darkness*, forcing its derivation for that purpose. It never has that sense, however, in any other place, but always the clear idea of *yesterday* or *yesternight* (Gen. xix. 34; xxxi. 29; 1 Kings xii. 26). But how could a word meaning *yesterday* be used for remote or indefinite past time? That objection is met by observing that תְּמוֹל, with the same meaning of *yesterday*, is used Ps. xc. 14: *a thousand years as yesterday*. Time past and gone, is all gone; yesterday is "with the years beyond the flood." And so all past time is called *yesterday*, even in the non-poetical language of the New Testament (Heb. xiii. 8, χθὲς καὶ σήμερον καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, "yesterday, to-day, and for the ages") It may be said, too, that this indefiniteness of time associates well with that indefiniteness of space, and is poetically suggested by it.

[6] Ver. 4. **The Acrid herb,** מַלּוּחַ. E. V., *mallows*. CONANT, the salt plant. Etymologically, any salt, ill-tasting herb.

[7] Ver. 4. **Roots of juniper.** CONANT, *broom* roots, (EWALD, *genisten-wurzel*). ZÖCKLER, *ginster-wurzel*.

[8] Ver. 5. *Lit.*, **from the body**—that is, of society. גֵּו does not mean specially *the back*. It does not suit this place, and it gives a false notion (גֵּוָה) Job xx. 25. The Syriac גו always has the sense of *within*, and becomes a preposition, as מִן גו *from within*.

[9] Ver. 6. **Gloomy gorge.** So עֲרוּץ נְחָלִים is well rendered by CONANT.

[10] Ver. 6. **Holes of earth.** עָפָר would suggest the idea of artificial rather than natural caverns. **Rocks:** כֵּפִים; etymologically *hollow rocks—caverns*—though the word in Syriac means *rock* or *stone* generally.

[11] Ver. 7. **They bray.** Descriptive future: *They are ever braying*. In vi. 5 נהק is used for the ass braying for food. The braying here is not necessarily for the same cause. Their famished state had already been expressed. It may denote their barbarous language, which sounded like braying, or some mere animal noise they made, whether of pain, or of wild exhilaration. שִׂיחִים the desert shrubs. The plural is here used to denote a more special locality, as demanded by the preposition בֵּין. So in Gen. xxi. 15: the desert shrubs under which Hagar cast the child Ishmael in the wilderness of Beersheba. Elsewhere it is שִׂיחַ, the singular taken collectively.

[12] Ver. 7. **Herd like beasts.** MICHAELIS and EICHHORN seem to give the truest exposition here, referring it to a beastly conduct demanding an euphemism for its expression. Such is the Hebrew word itself. ספח, primary sense *effundere*, the same in the Arabic, and easily giving rise to the rarer secondary meaning of *addition, flowing together, increase, association*. But this latter sense seems very poor here, and DELITZSCH'S rendering, "under the nettles are they poured forth" gives hardly any consistent idea. *Huddle together* would be better as suggesting smaller numbers. The general Arabic sense is that of *pouring*, like the Hebrew, but its third conjugation has the sense *scortari*, coming very naturally from the primary. It is a deponent, and in this corresponds to the Hebrew Pual, as the Arabic IIId, generally does. The best argument, however, is from the parallelism; the beastly sounds in the first member suggesting some kind of beastly action in the second. It is thus that Herodotus, I. 203, describes the ways of the old Caucasians of whose stock we boast ourselves to be. It is rather worse, because more open and shameful: μίξιν τε τούτων τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἶναι ἐμφανέα κατάπερ τοῖσι προβάτοισι.

[13] Ver. 8. **Sons of nameless sires.** Not *sons of infamy*, as some render it. The first בני is simply descriptive, like "*sons of Belial*," "*daughters* of song," as the word is often used in Hebrew. A *son of folly is*, simply, a fool. The context, however, demands that the second בני be taken as strictly genealogical: *sons of the nameless*,—thus intensifying their own namelessness.

[14] Ver. 8. **With scourgings.** נִכְּאוּ, *they are beaten*, can only indirectly mean that they are driven. They are whipped out of the land.

[15] Ver. 9. **Word of scorn.** מִלָּה, *a by-word*. Something often repeated. LXX. θρύλλημα. Job's appearance on their borders in his strange plight (see EXCURSUS, ADD., p.208), was the constant theme of their brutal jest. They could not understand his calamity.

[16] Ver. 10. **Their spittle,** or their *spitting*. The rendering, "they forbear not to spit before my face," would be merely charging them with a want of politeness. It has probably come from a supposed difficulty in רחקו, as though it meant a distance too great for spitting in the face;

11 Since HE hath loosed[17] my girdle—humbled me—
They, too, against me come with unchecked[18] rein.
12 At my right hand they rise, this beastly brood;
My feet they thrust aside;
Against me cast they up their deadly[19] ways.
13 They mar my[20] path;
As though 'twere gain to them,[21] they seek my hurt,
With none to help[22] (the mischief all their own).
14 Like a wide fracture in a[23] wall they come;
Beneath the desolation roll they on.

[PAUSE.]

15 All turned[24] against me—terrors everywhere;
My dignity it scatters like the wind;
Gone as a cloud is my prosperity.

but this supposition is not demanded. They stand some distance off, and spit *at him*, from some strange dread his appearance occasions. It is thus a most graphic picture of turpitude and ignorant malignity. Or the order of event may be different from that of expression: they spit at him, and then start back.

[17] Ver. 11. **Loosed my girdle.** The metaphors in the two members are different, but they suggest one another. The agent in the first clause is God, unnamed, as is frequently the case in Job, and for reasons similar to those given in note to iii. 20, and other places. The other verbs which have these Troglodytes for their subject are all plural (vers. 7, 8, 9, 10), and therefore it would be strange that there should be a singular, or a distributive, here. The verb פִּתַּח, literally *to open*, may be rendered to loose, when by the loosing something is made bare, and, therefore, in such a connection as this it cannot be used of the bow string, as some take it; nor as applied to God can it denote the metaphor of the loosened rein, as in the second clause. It must therefore be taken figuratively of the girdle (or the loins) as the symbol of strength. It may be said, too, that וַיְעַנֵּנִי would not suit as used of the wild horde. Their other acts are most specifically set forth, and it would be strange that such a general term (hath humbled or afflicted me) should occur among them. For these reasons, too, the Keri (יִתְרִי) *my cord*, is to be preferred to the Ketib יתרו.

[18] Ver. 11. **Unchecked rein.** The clause reads literally: *They send* (*or cast off*) *the rein* (or *bridle*) *before me.* רֶסֶן שִׁלֵּחוּ. It is exactly the Latin phrase *habenas immittere, or remittere.* So *remittere fræna—dare fræna*—German: *den Zugel schiessen lassen*—English: *Give him the rein:* Greek: ἐφεῖναι τὰς ἡνίας. שִׁלֵּחוּ, the Piel; they send, or throw them, violently, or suddenly,—cast them on the horse's neck, as EURIPIDES, πώλοις ἐμβάλοντες ἡνίας. The metaphor is a very natural one, and it does not require us to suppose that these creatures actually rode horses. It simply denotes the suddenness and violence of their attack.

[19] Ver. 12. **Their deadly ways.** *Lit.: The ways of their destruction.* The suffix in אֵידָם belongs to the whole compound expression. The whole figure denotes an invading and besieging host. The language is military and hyperbolical.

[20] Ver. 13. **They mar my path.** To be taken figuratively, says DELITZSCH: *They make escape impossible;* others: *they take away all my resources.* This answers very well in general: but there are grounds for taking much of this description in its most literal sense. These creatures wantonly destroy the poor accommodations Job had in his lonely leper house (בֵּית הַחָפְשִׁית, 2 Chron. xxvi. 20; Ps. lxxxviii. 6), and annoy him every way in his helplessness.

[21] Ver. 13. **As though it were gain to them.** Most commentators simply render this clause: "*They* aid my fall, or my ruin;" E. V., they set forward my calamity; giving יֹעִילוּ the sense of עָזַר. The references made by ZÖCKLER and others are to Zech. i. 15, and Isai. xlvii. 12, neither of which resemble this case in the essential point. The context sometimes allows this rendering to the verb (to *help*, to *aid*, *etc.*), but it never loses the radical idea of *profit*, real or supposed. This makes the contrast here, which the clause presents, although so very short. It might be rendered almost word for word according to a common English idiom: *they profit to my hurt.* But the future is subjective, not signifying an actual but a seeming fact: *they would profit;* or, *it is as though they would profit.* It is indeed pure wantonness, the mischief they do, but they labor as though they were really to get some gain from it. Then there is the implied personal contrast: whether it be gain, or wantonness, or sport to them, it is trouble and ruin to Job. In this view there is no need of bracketing any words in the full translation given. There is no more than is needed to express the contrast so concisely presented in the Hebrew.

[22] Ver. 13. **With none to help.** *Lit.: no helper to them.* EWALD renders this: *niemand hilft vor ihnen.* This is also Dr. CONANT'S: *There is no helper against them.* It seems to fit the passage admirably, but there cannot be found an example of לְ being thus used with this verb in the sense of *against.* The words put in brackets may be regarded as the briefest exegesis: They are too vile to have an ally. The mischief they do, and the malice they show against a man in Job's wretched condition is *sui generis:* "None but themselves can be their parallel."

[23] Ver. 14. **Fracture in a wall.** Compare Isaiah xxx. 13, where we have the exact image. It is the rendering of the VULGATE: *quasi fracto muro.* Here too there is something which has the appearance of being intended literally. It looks like a real assault upon Job's wretched temporary habitation (his בֵּית הַחָפְשִׁית, free or separate house, see note 20 above) whether upon the *mezbele* or place of offal far from the city of which DELITZSCH speaks (LXX., ἐπὶ τῆς κοπρίας ἔξω τῆς πόλεως) or on the border of the Desert according to the view taken EXC. X., p 207. They break it all down through pure recklessness, rushing in upon him and filling him with terror. The wholly figurative view would regard the language as denoting simply great change of condition, or great reverse of fortune; but there is too much particularity in the painting for that alone. If literal, it must refer to events which occurred to Job's annoyance before the coming of his three friends.

[24] Ver. 15. **All turned against me:** A total reverse of fortune, an *overthrow*, a *catastrophe.* הָהְפַּךְ is taken impersonally: *It is all upturned*, or, *there is an upturning*, an *overthrow* (a מַהְפֵּכָה see the word as often used of Sodom and Gomorrah) most graphically presented in the impersonal rendering of the verb regarded as having for its subject its own idea: *subversum est*, like the Latin *concurritur, pugnatur*, or, *pugnatum est, it is fought*, there is a battle. UMBREIT assumes God (unnamed) as the subject: Er hat sich gegen mich gewandt, "He is turned against me." But this does not suit the extremely passive Hophal conjugation as used here, although it might, perhaps, have been consistent with the use of the Niphal (see Note to xxviii. 5, and EXCURSUS VIII., pa. 201). The Kal having two related senses, namely, that of *transformation* (one thing *turning* into another), and that of *subversion* (turning upside down, or *reversal*), the Niphal is the passive of the *first* as the Concordance uniformly shows, the *Hophal* (comparatively unfrequent) of the latter.

16 And now my very[25] life is poured out;
The days of my affliction hold[26] me fast.
17 By night my every bone is pierced[27] above;
My throbbing nerves[28] (within me) never sleep.

Its subject must be the state or thing overthrown, and therefore cannot be God. The more common way is to take בַּלָּהוֹת for the subject, as DELITZSCH and EWALD do, but there is the same incongruity (terrors cannot be *overturned*, and even when it is rendered "*turned*" it makes but a vague and feeble sense) whilst there is the other difficulty arising from the disagreement both in gender and number. It is indeed the case that in Hebrew, where the verb precedes, there may be, sometimes, a subject, or seeming subject, differing in number; but this is not a mere arbitrary rule of the grammarians. There is a reason for it. In such cases the predominant subject is the very idea of the verb itself, which on that account comes first, whilst the subject afterwards expressed represents only an aspect of that more important idea. As for example Jer. li. 48, יָבוֹא לָהּ הַשּׁוֹדְדִים, "*shall* come (there shall be a coming) upon her,—the spoilers." The coming upon her, or that there should be an invasion, an invasion of the strong Babylon, was the strange thought, the important idea, and therefore the verb is placed first, and left uncontrolled by the number of the noun, in order to give it prominence or emphasis. In the preceding part of the same verse, on the other hand, the noun subject contains the predominant idea, and the verb, notwithstanding it is placed first, conforms to it: וְרִנְּנוּ עַל בָּבֶל שָׁמַיִם, "the *Heavens* shall cry out against Babylon." In this case, moreover, the accents make a separation between הֶהְפַּךְ and בַּלָּהוֹת, although the latter belongs to the same clause, and, therefore, there should be given to it something of an independent, or partially separate rendering, as the translator has endeavored to do, in order to prevent the enfeebling which would come from making it the sole subject of this abrupt and exclamatory verb: *terrors everywhere*, as the result of the *overturning*, whether taken literally or figuratively. So RENAN, Les terreurs m'assiégent *de tous parts*. The expression here might seem to resemble the one we have, 1 Sam. iv. 19, נֶהֶפְכוּ עָלֶיהָ צִרֶיהָ, rendered: *her pains were turned upon her*, but there it is Niphal, and, as we have elsewhere seen (EXCURSUS VIII., pa 202), denotes transformation, a sudden "*turn*," as we say, from quiet to extreme anguish. Besides in that case all is regular, whereas the peculiar feature of this passage is its passionate abruptness as shown in the brokenness and irregularity of its language. No commentator has taken a better view of this than the quaint and greatly unappreciated CARYL. He makes his exegesis and his pious practical commentary illustrate each other: "For as terrors discompose the mind and put it out of all due frame and order, so the construction of this text, wherein Job complains of them, is out of all grammatical frame and order. There is here a double *anomalie*, or breach of ordinary grammar. The word *terrors*, being of the plural number, is joined in construction with a verb in the singular; there is, also, a like irregularity in the genders of these two words. It is as if the Spirit of God would hint to us by these disturbed expressions, how much disturbance and irregularity such terms work and impress upon the affections," CARYL on Job, Vol. II. 710. This learned old non-conformist is right. The Spirit of God makes its revelation to us *through the souls of men*, through the medium of their emotions and conceptions; the language, therefore, that comes out to us from such a process is His language, even when most intensely human. The impassioned state of soul stamps itself upon such broken utterances; and to overlook them in an exegesis is to act the part of unfaithful interpreters. In these chapters, xxix. and xxx., we have pictures from the life. It is no invented thing. A true experience lies before us. The view taken of הֶהְפַּךְ is confirmed by the 2d and 3d clauses of this same verse. They are but illustrations of the great change of fortune so abruptly expressed in the first, whether we regard that as referring to the general description given in the xxix. (of which this may be taken as the reverse picture) or whether we suppose Job to have in mind the literal overthrow as before referred to, or to mingle both together in the images of the wind and the clouds that immediately follow. UMBREIT seems to enter into the spirit of the passage when he says of הֶהְפַּךְ עָלַי, als Ausruf zu nehmen. It is, in fact, an exclamation, an *outcry*, caused by the terror of the assault he seems to be describing, or by a sudden vivid recollection of the terrible overthrow or reversal of his condition, as though he had said: "dire catastrophe!—how great the change!—everything against me—all terror and confusion!" EICHHORN renders הֶהְפַּךְ עָלַי, "es ist mit mir ganz anders worden," taking it impersonally, and בלהות by itself as an addition to the general exclamation. There is no difficulty in making the subject of תרדף in the second clause refer to בלהות taken collectively; but a better way is to regard the feminine as denoting generally *the event*, or the whole course of events, for which the feminine pronoun would stand in Hebrew as the neuter does in Greek.

[25] Ver. 16. **My very life.** Literally: My soul is poured out *upon me*, or *my soul upon me*. It seems to be merely an intensive expression. Or, *upon me* may mean, while yet alive.

[26] Ver. 16. **Hold me fast.** יֹאחֲזוּנִי, the stubbornness and tenacity of his disease: will not let him go; no remission.

[27] Ver. 17. **Above.** Or more strictly *from above me*, מֵעָלַי. Hence TREMELLIUS renders it *perfodiuntur (a stragula) imposita mihi*, supplying *coverlet* or blanket as something that chafed his bones,—a rendering not at all unnatural, since the idea of a chafing or fretting of his garment, or bedclothes, is so easily suggested. Again, מעלי may mean not much more than עלי above, my bones *upon me*, *with me*, *in me*, as our translation has it (see the places in NOLDIUS where this preposition, like עלי, seems to have the meanings, *in*, *apud*, *juxta*). Thus taken it, too, may be merely intensive: *my very bones, each one of them*, as is denoted by the distributive plural with a singular verb. But there seems intended something of a contrast between the two members of the verse. The bones may be regarded as *above*, *without*, or *over*, in respect to the *nerves*, or *veins* supposed to belong more especially to the interiora of the body. We do, indeed, commonly think of the bones as *within*, but beside the general demand of such a comparison, there was something peculiar in Job's extreme emaciation, that would make the contrast very striking. His bones protruded; they had become visible; so that his body seemed like a skeleton, *all bones*. So he speaks of himself vii. 15: *Death rather than these bones*. So Elihu says xxxiii. 21, evidently meaning Job: *His bones before unseen stick out*. Compare also Ps. xxii. 18: "I can count all my bones, they *look* and *stare* at me." Thus viewed מֵעָלַי in its common literal sense of *above*, or *from above*, becomes not only allowable, but most appropriate. In his contemplation of himself in this condition, the bones become the outside of him, as it were. The rendering, *pierced from me*, as some translate, gives a strange sense, or if paraphrased as a *constructio prægnans* (ZÖCKLER: Die Nacht durchbohrt meine Gebeine, sie von mir ablösend, as also, in substance EWALD, DELITZSCH, UMBREIT, and RENAN) seems forced and unwarranted. The rendering of TREMELLIUS, "cut or *fretted* by the blanket *above*" is to be preferred, if the view here taken cannot be sustained. There is, moreover, the view of RASCHI, presenting less difficulty than the harsh *constructio prægnans* to which UMBREIT and ZÖCKLER are compelled to resort. He takes עצמי מעלי as equivalent to מעל עצמי, and interprets it as meaning "the worms who strip off the flesh from above my bones."

[28] Ver. 17. **My throbbing nerves,** עֹרְקַי. In Note 3 ver. 3 there have been already given some of the reasons for adhering to the old translation of the word in this place, as supported by the TARGUM, by MAIMONIDES, with the learned Jewish Rabbis, and by the older commentators, such as MERCERUS, PISCATOR, and others mentioned in POOLE'S *Synopsis*. ABEN EZRA renders it by גִּידִים *nervi* (LXX. νεῦρά μου) a sense which he says it has "in the Ishmaelitic language." So Kimchi in his book of roots: בערבי יקראו הגידין אלערוק, "in Arabic they call the nerves (or sinews)

18 By great exertion is my garment[29] changed;
Close as my tunic's mouth it girts me round.
19 Into the mire, His hand hath cast me[30] down;
To dust and ashes is my semblance[31] turned.
20 I call to Thee—Thou answerest not;
Before Thee do I stand—Thine eye beholds;
21 But Thou art turned relentless (to my prayer);
Thou art against me with Thy mighty hand.
22 Thou liftest me upon the wind to ride;
As in my very being[32] Thou dissolvest me.

אלערוק," using the Arabic article. It is thus used indiscriminately of all the finer or more interior parts of the body, as of *sinews*, *arteries*, or *veins*; and the latter especially were so called from the idea of continual motion in them increased by pain or heat. They were conceived of as continually *fleeing*, *throbbing*, pulsating, *etc.* (see Note on ערקים ver. 8). It is this which justifies the epithet added in the translation, and it would seem to have been some idea of this kind, as attaching to the word which suggested that other graphic expression לא ישכבון, they never lie down, they are never still. This was the thought, too, which suggested to RASCHI his interpretation of the word in this place: גידי אין להם מנוחה, to which he adds: in the Arabic גיד is called ערוק. So RABBI LEVI BEN GERSON renders it הדפקים, "my nerves that *pulse* and *never rest*, on account of the strange and distempered heat that is in me." MAIMONIDES, too, in his comment on this place has a similar thought about the motion caused by the increased heat of the body, and this leads him to a remark so curious that the translator hopes to be pardoned for inserting it. This most philosophical commentator has his thoughts so carried away by the idea suggested that he cannot stop short of the Primus Motor: "When a thing is moved we may say, it is the staff that moves the stone, but the hand moves the staff, the chords (המיתרים) move the hand, the muscles (העצבים) move the chords, the nerves (הערקים) move the muscles, the natural heat (החום הטבעי) moves the nerves, the *form* (הצורה, the idea, law, nature, *formal* arrangement of the matter) moves the natural heat, the Prime Mover God (הראשון) moves, originates and sets in action, the idea." On this frequent Rabbinical word, see BUXTORF Lex. Chald., and the Worterbuch Chaldaisches, lately published, of RABB. DR. J. LEVY. It is an argument for this sense of ערקי that it seems demanded by the parallelism. The mention of bone in the first clause, requires that some other part of the body should be the subject of the second. The Syriac ערקא, wherever it occurs in the Peschito version of the Old and New Testaments, always means some kind of *ligament* (*lorum*) *string* or *cord*, being equivalent to גידים by which the Rabbins render the Hebrew ערק. See Gen. xiv. 13 (*corrigia*, *strings* or ties for the shoe) Isai. v. 27; Job i. 27; Ezek. xxiii. 15; Mark i. 7; Luke iii. 16; Acts xiii. 25. The participial form is one common to a great many Hebrew nouns like שרק סהר, *etc.*

[29] Ver. 18. **My garment changed.** The word התחפש occurs in this Hithpahel form in four places, 1 Sam. xxviii. 8, which is the key passage, 1 Kings xxii. 30; 2 Chron. xviii. 29, and 1 Kings xx. 38. The first gives us the sense of the word as clear as any Lexicon could have done. It shows that the sense of disguise is not, by itself, the predominant one The word simply expresses the mode by which it is effected, as the words immediately following show: *he disguised himself*, that is, put on other garments, וילבש. בגדים אחרים which may be regarded as epexegetical of it. The 2d and 3d examples in the same way give the explanation: The kings in the battle exchanged garments. In 1 Kings xx. 38, the disguise seems to have been made in a different way, באפר על עיניו, *with ashes upon his eyes*, as commonly rendered, but as rendered by the LXX. with a strip or belt (τελαμῶνι) upon his eyes,—the word being אפר instead of אפר, the usual one for ashes. GESENIUS regards it as a different word, if the true reading of the text before them was not, rather, אפד (unpointed), an *ephod* or linen veil. Reading it, however, as *ashes* it may fairly be taken as something additional to the action expressed by the verb יתחפש just before it; or it may well be that the phrase, originally meaning change of raiment, had come to represent the idea of disguise in whatever way effected. If this is regarded as inherent in the Hithpahel form it may, perhaps, be supposed to come from the Kal sense *to seek*, *investigate*, *etc.*, with the reflexive idea added: one who causes himself to be sought, *inquired after*. This, however, is not easy, and a more direct way, if allowable, would be to regard the sense of change of raiment as predominant, and connect it with the cognate חפש, *to be free from*, *liber*, *solutus*, as in the word חפשי, Job iii. 9, and many other places. Hence the idea of having the garment stripped off, or of being *free* from it, to be replaced by another. So PARKHURST would seem to view it, though, from his disregard of the Hebrew punctuation the two verbs are regarded by him, not simply as cognate, but as one and the same root. It should be noted, too, that in any view we may take of the word, the idea of disguise is not in the garment, but in the person. Here, however, to give it any application at all in that sense, it is the garment itself that is disguised. That could in no way be truly said, though it were ever so much fouled by the disease. If the view taken can be sustained, it certainly gives a clear and suitable sense. Job undoubtedly would desire to change his garments. There are a number of passages (see especially iv. 31) which show that he was very sensitive in this matter, and that his neatness was greatly offended by the foulness of condition produced by his disease. This would make the change very desirable, and, at the same time, very difficult in consequence of the adhesion. The necessity for it, and the pain occasioned, would be no small part of his wretchedness, and even hyperbolical language would seem most natural in describing the effort for that purpose. The chief difficulty of the other view is in the words רב כה. To render this "*divine*" or "almighty force," as DELITZSCH and UMBREIT do, seems utterly extravagant, and to take it of the violence of the disease, as E. V. and others do, is not warranted by any other usage of כה. The second clause gives the reason why so much force was required, and which would seem all the greater from the pain it occasioned.

[30] Ver. 19. **Cast me down.** הרן. *Dejecit.*

[31] Ver. 19. **My semblance turned.** *Lit.: I have likened myself.* But the Hithpahel is intensive rather than simply reflex: I am become the *picture*, the perfect copy or *resemblance*. The reference is doubtless to the earthy, ashen, cadavarous appearance that the leprosy occasioned; though there probably mingles with it something of that idea of weakness and mortality connected with the word ashes in other parts of the Bible.

[32] Ver. 22. **As in my very being.** This is given as the best rendering of that difficult word תושיה in its accommodation to the demands of this place (see Exc. V. p. 189 and also Notes upon it, xii. 16; xxvi. 3, and other places). Its general etymological sense of *reality*, *solidity*, *substantiality*, *true being*, *or οὐσία*, may be referred either to knowledge or truth. It is the deepest essence, and may be taken here adverbially, as is not unfrequently the case with qualifying

23 I know that Thou wilt turn me back[33] to death,
The assembly house[34] ordained for all that live.
24 Ah! prayer is nought,[35] when He sends forth the hand;
In each[36] man's doom, of what avail their cry?

25 Have I not wept[37] for him whose life is hard?
Has not my very soul grieved[38] for the poor?

Hebrew nouns, *essentialiter*, *substantialiter*, *οὐσιωδῶς*. It may have, moreover, something of a superlative sense, like the similar words נֵצַח excellency, truth, splendor, לָנֶצַח *completely, triumphantly*, or תַּכְלִית *perfection, perfectly*. TREMELLIUS: Efficis ut diffluam *substantia*; COCCEIUS, among the older commentators: et maceras me reapse (re ipsa), *in very truth*, using it as a term of intensity. VULGATE *valide*. BUXTORF, Lex. Chald., *in essentia, id est, ut tota essentia pereat, totaliter, et omnino*; though he seems to regard it as equivalent to a Targumic word תְּשִׁיתָא, meaning *foundation*. DE WETTE, zerrüttest Sinn und Geist. Others translate it *happiness, safety*, though still retaining the old reading. Our translators, by "*substance*," may have meant wealth, as the Greeks use the word *οὐσία*, so very similar etymologically. In the margin, however, they have given the word *wisdom*. This old rendering, *being, essence, reality, etc.*, is entitled to the more regard in view of the great difficulty later commentators (EWALD, DILLMANN, DELITZSCH, ZÖCKLER) have in giving anything more satisfactory. They render it, "the *crash, noise, roaring* of the storm;" ZÖCKLER: und lässest mich zergehen in Sturmesbrausen. But to get this they have to take another and quite different reading, תשואה, as found in xxxvi. 29, and xxxix. 7. UMBREIT and GESENIUS turn it into a verb, תְּשַׁוֶּה, and give it the sense of a Chaldaic word found only in another conjugation: "*Thou frightenest me*." But there is no suffix pronoun, as there ought to be in such a case. The greatest objection, however, besides the change required in the reading, is the wretched anticlimax it makes: "Thou catchest me up to the wind: thou makest me to ride upon it; thou dissolvest me; *thou frightenest me*." It is supposed by some that the first clause is meant to represent Job's prosperity, the second his downfall. But there are no words giving the least indication of such a contrast, and there is little in the calm, God-fearing, domestic happiness of Job, that suggests such a picture of sudden elation. It is rather that of ruin expressed in a weird and passionate style which almost resembles the language of delirium. Such an idea is favored by that most sober Jewish commentator ABEN EZRA, who ascribes this strange language to the "wild imaginations caused by fever; Job dreams of riding on the wind." It may, in fact, have been one of those "scaring visions" of which he speaks vii. 14; xx. 8, and which formed no small part of his misery. There is nothing, as CARYL supposes, unworthy of the Scriptures in such an idea. Were not the first clause so clear, so incapable of being taken in any other way, we might almost suspect the translation as too Shakesperian, or Dantean, for Job, though he shows much more imagination than the other speakers. But everything except the תֻּשִׁיָּה is so perspicuous, the "being lifted up to the wind," the "riding upon it," the being "dissolved," or melting way, that there can be no doubt of the rendering: It reminds one of Virgil's description of the expiating processes endured by spirits, Æn. VI., 740.

——Aliæ panduntur inanes
Suspensæ ad ventos.

Job's language resembles some of the mad utterances of Lear, giving the impression that called out the comment of ABEN EZRA. It is almost in the very words of Othello:

"Blow me about in winds,"

presenting also something of a parallel to Homer's language, employed Odyss. IV. 727, and elsewhere, to denote utter and remediless destruction:

ἄϊστον ἀνηρείψαντο θύελλαι,——

a "carrying away by the gales," a "disappearing" in their unknown viewless regions. Stress has been laid on the fact that the word is abbreviated in its vowels, whereas in other places it is written full (תֻ for תּוּ); but this is evidence rather of some difficulty which old transcribers or editors may have had about the meaning of the word, and hence of a desire to exchange it for another. Had there been some other word in the original it is almost incredible that this difficult תּוּשִׁיָּה should have been put in place of it. MERX, as usual, solves the difficulty by his arbitrary reading תְּשַׁדְּנִי.

[33] Ver. 23. **Turn me back.** Comp. שׁוּב, Gen. iii. 19; שׁוּבוּ בְנֵי אָדָם, "*Go back ye sons of Adam,*" Ps. xc. 3.

[34] Ver. 23. **The assembly house.** בֵּית מוֹעֵד, the house of rendezvous, of *gathering*. It suggests the frequent phrase *gathered to the fathers*, gathered to his people. All such language must have come from some idea of death or Sheol being a place of waiting for something to come after it. See LANGE Gen., Note 585.

[35] Ver. 24. **Prayer is nought.** The translation given of the whole verse is nearly that of RENAN:

Vaines prières!—il étend sa main;
A quoi bon protester contre ses coups?

אַךְ לֹא־בְעִי. The negative לֹא, here, seems to be a qualifying rather than an impliedly asserting particle. It is joined with בְּעִי, *prayer*, like our inseparable negative syllables *in, im, un*; as in לֹא חָסִיד *impius* Ps. xliii. 1; לֹא עָז, *infirmus* Prov. xxx. 25; לֹא אִישׁ, *without men*, uninhabited, *ἀπάνθρωπος*; לֹא דֶרֶךְ, without a way, *invius*, *ἄπορος*, *ἄβατος*, *wayless, trackless*. It is a case that is *prayerless*, he would say, that is, where prayer is of no avail; the substantive verb understood: It is a prayer that is no prayer, like the Greek *πόρος ἄπορος*. For the other view which resolves the word into parts, בְּ and עִי, see DELITZSCH.

[36] Ver. 24. **In each man's doom . . . their cry.** It is a case where a distributive singular in one part corresponds to a plural pronoun in the other. Our own tongue admits it. But what authority for giving it this turn, or inserting the words "*of what avail*," or, *a quoi bon*, as RENAN does? It is because of the אִם, leaving the question unanswered, or making what is called an aposiopesis,—a silence that leaves the answer to the thought as the most expressive way of asserting its unavailableness: "*what if they do cry?*" It occurs in all passionate or animated language, but especially in the ancient. "If it bear fruit," Luke xiii. 9. There is nothing more there in the Greek; but the silent answer is all the more expressive on that account. "He that planted the ear (Ps. xciv. 9), shall he not hear? He that fashioned the eye, shall he not see? He that teacheth man knowledge"—There it closes in the Hebrew, but the answer is admirably given in E. V. in italics: "*Shall he not know?*" Shall the source of knowledge be unintelligent? For a striking example, see Iliad I. 26. So here: "*If they cry*, each of them (בְּפִידוֹ in his own special doom),—what then?" There is, however, nothing here like an arraignment of God for injustice or cruelty. It is simply stating the inevitableness of death as the common doom. It is in this way no harsher than Gen. iii. 19, and Ps. xc. 3. The fem. לָהֶן may be a mere matter of euphony to avoid the harshness of final ם before שׁ in שׁוּעַ (see the *Sepher Ha Rikma* or Hebrew Grammar of JONA BEN GANNACH, Sec. VI., changes of ם and ן, pa. 37, where he gives a number of analogous examples). We have examples of לָהֶן for לָהֶם Ruth i. 13, and of הֵנָּה for הֵמָּה, 2 Sam. iv. 6.

[37] Ver. 25. **Have I not?** אִם לֹא is equivalent to a strong assertion; but the interrogative form is the more pathetic.

[38] Ver. 25. **Grieved,** עָגְמָה. This verb occurs but once. The context, however, leaves little doubt about it, though we get no help either from the Syriac or the Arabic.

26 But when I looked for good, then evil came;[39]
When I expected light, then darkness came.
27 My very bowels boil,[40] they're never still;
The days of pain have overtaken me.
28 Mourning I go,[41] no sunlight (on my way).
In the assembly do I rise; I cry aloud.
29 Brother am I to howling desert[42] dogs,
Companion to the owls.
30 My skin is black above;[43]
My bones are dried with heat.
31 My harp,[44] to mourning is it turned;
My organ like the tones of those who weep.

[39] Ver. 26. **Evil came ... darkness came.** The repetition of the same word, both in the Hebrew and in the English, increases the force and pathos.

[40] Ver. 27. **Bowels boil.** This may mean mental affliction (bowels put for the feelings), but it is easier taken literally.

[41] Ver. 28. **Mourning I go;** or, *with darkened face* I go. The key to this obscure verse is to be found, we think, in Jer. iv. 28, where a day of trouble is thus described by the same verb, קָדְרוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם מִמָּעַל, *the heavens are darkened above.* The sense of *mourning* in קדר comes from that of obscuration. The sunlight denotes joy and happiness, as in Eccles. xi. 7, "sweet is the light, and pleasant to the eyes to behold the sun." The sense of the words put in brackets are really included in the idea of הִלַּכְתִּי. The second clause seems abrupt and disconnected, but this is what is to be expected in such a passionate strain.

[42] Ver. 29. **Howling desert dogs.** It is some hideous animal that makes a wailing melancholy sound, and that is all that can be determined from BOCHART's long discussion. The word in the second clause may be rendered ostriches, but the idea of desolation intended is far better given by *owls*, as in E. V.; at least to our modern conceptions.

[43] Ver. 30. **My skin is black above.** See remarks on מַעַל in Note 10, ver. 17. The contrast there was between bones and the more interior parts, *nerves* or *sinews.* Here it is between the skin *above*, and the bones as the interior. It may be rendered *my skin upon me.*

[44] Ver. 31. **My harp,** *etc.* The exact nature of the musical instruments here mentioned, it is now very difficult to determine. An objection is made to rendering עוּגָב, here and Ps. cl. 4, by the word *organ.* It is however a wind instrument, and may, therefore, be a combination of pipes; or *organ* may be taken for any compound instrument, complex or simple. The single pipe was a shepherd's instrument, and hardly corresponds to our idea of the dignity of Job. It may be said, however, that a seeming exactness may sometimes fail as a translation by destroying the very impression intended to be made. RENAN, we think, exemplifies this.

> Ma *guitare* s'est changée en instrument de deuil;
> Mon *hautbois* ne rend que des sons de pleurs.

Something antique is needed, yet still enough understood to give the effect intended, without marring by a lowering familiarity. In general, however, no translator excels RENAN in purity and taste.

CHAPTER XXXI.

1 Yes,[1] I did make a covenant for[2] mine eyes;
How[3] then could I upon a virgin gaze?
2 What portion of Eloah from above,
What heritage [could I expect[4]] from Shaddai in the heights?
3 Does not a woe await the evil man?
A vengeance strange,[5] to malefactors due?

[1] Ver. 1. **Yes.** We cannot suppose that the commencing words of this chapter come directly after the closing words of the xxx. There is no inconsistency, but certainly a change of style, indicating a silent meditation for a few moments, and then a sudden resuming with the thought to which it had led him. Thus regarded, the starting *yes*, or something equivalent, is nothing more than the expression of such a resuming. The need of it in the Hebrew was compensated, virtually, by the feeling of the context, and, perhaps, by look, tone, or gesture.

[2] Ver. 1. **For mine eyes.** Not as a party *with* whom the covenant is made, for that would require עִם, but rather as the evil or enemy against whom Job had made a solemn compact with God. Hence the language that follows—*how could I, etc.*

[3] Ver. 1. **How then?** It is the strongest denial. *Why*, as commonly rendered, is too tame, as though simply asking *what reason could I have?*

[4] Ver 2. **Could I expect.** These words in brackets are but the filling up of what is clearly implied.

[5] Ver. 3. **A vengeance strange,** נֵכֶר. See the same segolate, only with the O vowel, Obad. 12. The primary idea of *strangeness* adheres in the word, but giving it a bad sense as suggestive of the *awful*, the *sudden* in calamity. There is the same word in Arabic, with the O vowel, and used precisely as this is here and in Obadiah 12. For clear examples see HARIRI, Seance xiii., p. 153 (*De Sacy, Ed.*) xvi., p. 188, xxiv. 288. It occurs in the same sense in the Koran; as in Surat lxv. 8, xviii. 86, where it is joined with the most severe word for punishment: "He shall visit him with a strange (*nukran*) or awful penalty." In Surat xviii. 73 it is, in the same way, associated with the crime of murder: "Hast thou slain an innocent person, then hast thou done a thing (*nukran*), awful, strange." Compare the very similar language in the Anima Mundi of TIMÆUS the Locrian, 104 E: τιμωρίαι ξέναι, "strange vengeances," the fearful nature of which is shown in the context. Compare it with ξένον, 1 Pet. iv. 12.

4 Does He not see my course of life,
And number all my steps?
5 If I have walked in ways[6] of vanity,
Or if my foot hath hasted to deceit,—
6 So weigh[7] me God in scales of righteousness
And know Eloah mine integrity.

7 If from the path my step hath turned aside,
Or soul hath strayed[8] submissive to mine eyes,
Or aught of blemish to my hand hath cleaved,
8 Then let me sow, and let another reap,
And let my plantings all be rooted up.
9 By[9] woman, if my heart hath been seduced,
Or at my neighbor's door, if I have watched,
10 Then let my wife for others grind;[10]
Let others humble[11] her.
11 For that were deed of foul intent[12],—
A sin demanding sentence from the Judge.
12 A fire[13] consuming to the lowest[14] hell,
And killing[15] all my increase at the root.

[6] Ver. 5. **Ways of.** This is implied in the metaphor: **vanity.** The Hebrew שָׁוְא denotes generally what is most false and vile, the *good for nothing* as opposed to the sound or the true. We have become accustomed to our word *vanity* in its usual Scriptural rendering, and as thus understood nothing could be better adapted here.

[7] Ver. 6. **So weigh me God.** It is the language of adjurative appeal, like the words "*so help me God*," "*God do so to me*," *etc.* The most concise rendering, therefore, is the clearest as well as the most forcible. The reader need hardly be reminded that *weigh* and *know* are both to be taken as the 3d pers. Imperative.

[8] Ver. 7. **Or soul hath strayed.** Lit.: *Or my heart has gone after mine eyes.* לב here, as in many other places, denotes the *will* or *active reason*, rather than the mere feeling. It is what Socrates calls the *reversal*, or turning upside down, or wrong end foremost, of human nature, indicating a dire *catastrophe:* the reason following the sense, and *submitting* to the sense instead of controlling it.

[9] Ver. 9. **By woman;** or, *on account of*, as על may be rendered.

[10] Ver. 10. **Grind.** The commentators generally make an unnecessary display of learning here.

[11] Ver. 10. **Humble her.** The rendering here best corresponding to a Scriptural expression עָנָה אִשָּׁה, Deut. xxii. 24, 29; Jud. xix. 24; xx. 5; Gen. xxxiv. 2. The servile idea, however, is the main thing. The other is indicated as a mere incident to it, and there was less indelicacy in the language than would now be felt. But would not this be a great sin in Job, to think or utter such a wish? No commentator treats such questions more purely and judiciously than the Puritan Caryl. After admitting that there was wrong and rashness in such language, he goes on to speak of it as the "strongest expression of the retributive or retaliatory idea (*the lex talionis:* as he hath done to others, so be it done to him) which, in itself, or as brought about in the causative or permissive providence of God (2 Sam. xii. 10; Hos. iv. 12, 13, 14) is the very essence of justice." "But holy Job," he farther says, "did not strictly wish his wife's adultery. He speaks thus to show that by the law of counterpassion he deserved to have suffered in such a way had he himself been guilty. An adulterous and unfaithful wife is a fit affliction for an adulterous and unfaithful husband. Breach of the marriage covenant is a due reward for marriage covenant breakers."

[12] Ver. 11. **Of foul intent.** זִמָּה primarily means *purpose, intent*, but is mostly taken *in malam partem*, like the Latin *facinus*, which is, etymologically, a *deed* or *doing*, but in usage denotes a *bad deed*, an *enormity*. So the Greek ἔργον unqualified, or when joined with μέγα, is taken in a bad sense, μέγα ἔργον being equivalent to κακὸν ἔργον;—a most severe satire which language, in its unconscious formation thus casts upon human nature. It is nothing less than an implication that the majority of human acts, especially the great and notorious, are so surely evil that the word becomes a synonym for the idea of crime. The same linguistic law affects this Hebrew word. It is equivalent here to an act done feloniously, or with *malitia,—malice prepense*—as our law calls it; not so much, however, in such a case as this, with the idea of passion, or hatred, as with that of evil design, or depravity, of any kind.

[13] Ver. 12. **A fire consuming.** It is quite common in the Scriptures to compare this sin to *a fire*. See Prov. vi. 27, 28, 29. The language there is, most likely, derived from this older Scripture. For the richest illustrations of the way in which it consumes every thing, body, estate, honor, dignity, conscience, and, finally, the very soul itself, see CARYL, Practical Remarks on the passage.

[14] Ver. 12. **The lowest hell.** There is more of literality in it than commentators express. See remarks on the word אֲבַדּוֹן Note 5, ver. 5, chap. xxvi., and Excursus VI., p. 20. It may be taken here as strong hyperbolical language, like that in Deut. xxxii. 2, תַּחְתִּיּוֹת שְׁאוֹל, instead of confining it to the mere etymological sense of *loss* or destruction. It is entire destruction, body and soul, in the world of destruction. The words reach there, whatever measure of force or of idea Job put upon them.

[15] Ver. 12. **Killing.** תְּשָׁרֵשׁ here can hardly be confined to the sense of *uprooting*, tearing up the roots, *eradicans*. It would be out of harmony with the figure of the consuming fire which is the subject of תְּשָׁרֵשׁ as well as of תֹּאכֵל. It is rather the fire of lust, killing the root as well as the branches. So MERX very happily renders it:

Das alle Frucht mir in der Wurzel tödtet;

whilst most of the later German Commentators, like UMBREIT, SCHLOTTMANN, EWALD, DELITZSCH, DILLMANN, ZÖCKLER, destroy the metaphor by giving the sense of *uprooting*, or *rooting out*. It might have been seen that the preposition ב in בְּכָל was in the way of this. It must either be regarded as redundant, or it denotes some deadly influence in or upon the *increase*—not uprooting, but killing it in its root, bringing death into the very root of all prosperity, whether belonging to the outward or the inward estate, all of which may be denoted by the word תְּבוּאָה, *revenue, income.* In such a wide way is it used, Prov. xviii. 20, "the income *or fruit of the lips*,' תְּבוּאַת שְׂפָתָיו, or what a man gains or loses by his talk. Here, as CARYL well says, it denotes every

13 My serf,[16] or handmaid, if I spurned[17] their right,
When their complaint before[18] me they have laid,
14 What could I do when God to judgment[19] rises?
When He makes search, what could I answer him?
15 Who in the womb made me, made He not him?
And from one[20] common mother formed us both?
16 From poor men's want,[21] if I have kept[22] aloof,
Or caused the widows' eyes to fail[23],—
17 If I have eaten by myself alone,
And from my crust the orphan had no share,
18 [No—like a father, from my youth, he made[24] me his support,
And from my earliest dawn[25] of life was I to her a guide],
19 If e'er I saw[26] the perishing, with nought to cover him,
Or any lack of raiment to the poor,
20 His very loins, if they have blessed me not,
When[27] from my lambs' fleece he hath felt the warmth,

thing which may be called worth or value in a man, not only outward estate, but honor, fair repute, spiritual dignity. Of all this the very roots are killed, burnt out by this fire of hell. It "leaves neither *root* nor branch." Comp. Malachi iii. 23.

[16] Ver. 13. **Serf.** עֶבֶד here is not a slave or bondsman bought with money. Neither, on the other hand, is he, probably, a perfectly free hired laborer. The context seems to intimate a vassal, or client, under the jurisdiction of a superior lord.

[17] Ver. 13. **I spurned.** It can hardly be rendered in any other way; and yet it is a question worth noticing why the future form is used here instead of the preterite as in אם הלכתי ver. 5 above. The only answer is that the verb for *despising* is more inward or subjective, and that there is denoted here *disposition*, state of soul, *intention* (looking to futurity) rather than a single outward act as is expressed by the other word, though apparently in the same grammatical connection. It is also more conditional or hypothetical: *if I should ever have been so disposed.* The keeping this idea in mind will explain changes in the Hebrew tenses which otherwise would seem wholly arbitrary.

[18] Ver. 13. **Before me.** עִמָּדִי, in the second clause, confirms the opinion expressed above that this is the relation of lord and vassal, in which the former could not be sued by the latter as an equal party in an outward court. In such a case it would have been עִמִּי instead of עִמָּדִי, as DELITZSCH well observes on the authority of the Talmud. The preposition עִם would denote *litigation* with; עִמָּד may be rendered *apud, penes,* at my own tribunal, in the lord's manor court where he sits as judge, not as party. The claim that Job makes here is stronger on this account: He rendered justice, he listened to the complaints of his vassal, even against himself, though no outward law compelled him to do them justice. בְּרִבָם may express either kind of interpleading.

[19] Ver. 14. **To judgment.** Implied in יָקוּם אֵל. See Ps. vii. 7; ix. 20; iii. 8; xvii. 13; lxviii. 2.

[20] Ver. 15. **One common mother**—one common source or origin. Make אחד the subject, and refer to Malachi ii. 10. See DELITZSCH. The LXX. and Symmachus take it as agreeing with רֶחֶם. There is no need of the article. This DELITZSCH admits, and also that it may express unity of kind rather than a numerical oneness. בטן can only mean the womb as place; רֶחֶם as a derivative from the sense of *loving, cherishing, fovens,* denotes maternity in general.

[21] Ver. 16. **Poor men's want.** חֵפֶץ, *desire, purpose.* It might be rendered here, *prayer.*

[22] Ver. 16. **Kept aloof.** The subjective future אמנע, indicating disposition, or rather *aversion.* See Note 16, ver. 13.

[23] Ver. 16. **To fail;** with looking for relief and disappointment. See Lam. iv. 17. *Our eyes fail for our help,* that is, with looking for it.

[24] Ver. 18. **Made me his support.** גְּדֵלַנִי. This is variously rendered: UMBREIT, EWALD, DELITZSCH, ZÖCKLER, DILLMANN, *wuchs er mir, he grew up to me,* as if we should say concisely in English, *he grew me up.* SCHLOTTMANN, *erzog ich sie,* for what he takes as the literal, *sie wuchs mir auf.* This is very similar to the rendering, *he grew up with me,* which some give; as UMBREIT, who thinks it may stand for גָּדַל עִמִּי. That would resemble 2 Chron. x. 8, where it is said of Rehoboam's young companions, גָּדְלוּ אִתּוֹ *who grew up with him.* But there the preposition makes a marked difference. Had it been גָּדְלוּ אִתּוֹ the cases would have been similar. The Piel reading has been proposed, גִּדְּלַנִי (OLSHAUSEN) *er ehrte mich, he magnified, honored* me. That however gives too strong, and at the same time, too limited a sense. Growing up *with me,* or *to me,* would denote the relation of foster brothers rather than that of patron and ward. Although it would be rare, there would be nothing in the way of keeping the Kal form, and giving it the sense of *esteeming great.* In this it will agree with the Latin *magnifico,* and the Greek μεγαλύνω, which are both used in this way sometimes. The nearest resemblance to it, however, would be found in the Greek αὔξω, αὐξάνω, which is intransitive primarily, like גָּדַל or גָּדֵל, but becomes transitive with an object of the person, and the sense of *esteeming great;* hence of honoring; celebrating, as a nurse, or patron. See Oed. Tyr. 1091:

σὲ καὶ τροφὸν καὶ μητέρ' αὔξειν.

Allied to this is the version above given, *to esteem great,* that is, *rely upon as his support.* There is an impassioned eloquence in this irregular burst from the hypothetical to the direct asseveration, as though the thought of what he had truly done to the orphan and the widow would not allow him to pass on without this vehement parenthetical statement.

[25] Ver. 18. **Earliest dawn of life.** The literal Hebrew: *from my mother's womb,* is evidently hyperbolical. As far back as I can remember was I a guide to the widow and a friend to the orphan.

[26] Ver. 19. **If e'er I saw.** Another subjective future in אֶרְאֶה. See Note [16], ver. 13, and [22], ver. 16. If I *could bear to see it*—have the heart to look upon it.

[27] Ver. 20. **When.** This is generally taken as a separate hypothetical *asseveration* with אִם understood: "If from my lamb's fleece, *etc.*" There is, however, not only no need of such an ellipsis, but it actually destroys the pathos as well as the grammatical simplicity of the passage. It needlessly makes two asseverations out of one act, the second clause being simply a touching illustration of the effect of the beneficence mentioned in the first clause and the verse before. It is the feeling of the soft, warm, comforting lamb's fleece, that makes the shivering loins pour out their blessing on

21 If o'er the orphan I have stretched my hand,
When at the gate[28] I saw my helper near,—
22 Then fall my shoulder from its blade,
And let my arm be broken from the bone.
23 For God's destruction would have been my fear;
Before His majesty I could not stand.

24 If I have made the gold my confidence,
Or to the coined[29] gold said, thou art my trust;
25 If I rejoiced[30] because my wealth was great,
Or that my[31] hand had gotten mighty store;
26 If e'er I saw[32] the sunlight when it shone,
The moon in glory as it walked above,
27 And then my soul was silently enticed,
And hand (in adoration)[33] touched my mouth;
28 Even that[34] would be a sin for vengeance calling,
For then had I been false to God above.[35]
29 If in my foe's calamity I joyed,
Or lifted up myself when ill befell him,
30 (No, no[36]—I suffered not my mouth to sin,
To ask a malediction on his life);
31 If men of mine own household have not said,
"O tell us one not sated from his meat,
32 (The[37] stranger never lodged without;
My doors I opened to the traveller");

the giver. The conjunction ו may indicate almost any kind of connection, *time, reason, inference, comparison*; or it may be merely copulative. The spirit of the context here demands the first. *When* he felt the lambs' wool it *warmed* him into gratitude that could not refrain from pouring it-self out in benedictions. This mode of taking it also agrees best with the Hithpahel יִתְחַמָּם.

[28] Ver. 21. **The gate.** The place of judicial proceeding. The *helper* is some corrupt ally among the judges.

[29] Ver. 24. **Coined gold;** rendered generally, the pure gold, or fine gold. See Note on כֶּתֶם, chap. xxviii., ver. 16.

[30] Ver. 25. **Rejoiced.** *Subj. fut.* See Note 26.

[31] Ver. 25. **My hand.** This is not a tautology. The first joy relates to the abundance, the second to the self-acquisition.

[32] Ver. 26. **If e'er I saw.** אֶרְאֶה *Subj. Fut.* See Note 26. CONANT calls it here the Future, or Imperfect of repeated action. But it comes to the same thing. Repeated action expresses *disposition, tendency*, what one is wont to do, and so demands the tense of continuous or unfinished action.

[33] Ver. 27. **In adoration.** This is certainly implied, whatever may have been the mode. But it is clear enough. The barely touching the hand to the mouth is just the gentle, silent act which would be prompted by a rising thought of adoration. The idea of throwing a kiss is a trifling modernism. It implies submission—silence, rather—laying the hand upon the mouth. If any kind of worship, except to God, could be thought blameless, it would be Sabæism in such a gentle form. Job's selecting this, therefore, shows how far he was from the first thought of idolatry.

[34] Ver. 28. **Even that,** or *that too*, גַּם הוּא, light as it might seem, would have been a sin, and one to be ranked in enormity with adultery, ver. 11, and called like it עָוֹן, פְּלִילִים, or פְּלִילִי. It would have been not simply impiety, but falseness—express or implied *violation of covenant* by which a rational being is bound to God (בְּרִית or *religio*) like that of the marriage vow. There is suggested the same idea here that appears elsewhere in the Old Testament, and especially in the Prophets, of the affinity between the sins of adultery and idolatry.

[35] Ver. 28. **To God above,** מִמָּעַל. However enticing the conception, that would be the enormity of it, namely, falseness to Him who is above the heavens, and "putteth His glory upon or above the heavens," Ps. viii. 2; 'Who looketh down (stoopeth down הַמַּשְׁפִּילִי לִרְאוֹת), to see even the things in the heavens," Ps. cxiii. 6. DELITZSCH's rendering *geheuchelt, plays the hypocrite*, fails to meet the idea.

[36] Ver. 39. **No, no** (*οὐμενοῦν*). Another of those impassioned outbreaks, driving the speaker from the more even hypothetical style of denial. See Note 24, ver. 18. He will not even allow it as a supposition that he could have done so. In such a case, not only acts, but words and thoughts of evil were kept under strictest guard. The same breach comes again, ver. 32. The irregularity increases with the passion. Sentences are commenced and left unfinished; a vehement protasis has no apodosis; strong parenthetical appeals every where break in, and when the general vindication is resumed, it is in another strain, and apparently lacking any direct connection with what preceded the broken utterance. It has led some commentators to talk of interpolations and displacements; and, what seems most strange, this is often done by those who are fondest of characterizing the book as "a work of art," and who have most to say, in a patronizing style, of "the genius of the old Dichter." The exceeding eloquence of the chapter is in these very irregularities. They are evidence of the highest art, or rather of that *reality* of which we have spoken as transcending all art. An evidence of this is the difficulty of putting it into English, and especially of giving it a right grammatical punctuation,—there are so many sentences apparently unfinished, and from which the speaker seems driven by the strong and wayward current of his conflicting emotions. The two most impassioned dramas in the world's literature are the Lear of SHAKESPEARE, and the Œdipus Coloneus of SOPHOCLES. In neither of them do we find anything that, for emotional eloquence, can be compared to this vindicatory protest of Job.

[37] Ver. 32. **The stranger.** This first clause of ver. 32 may be taken as a continuation of what was said by the "men of his household," to whose testimony he appeals in the preceding verse. The 2d clause also (*my doors, etc.*) might be regarded as the same, in spirit, as though it had been,

33 If I, like Adam, mine offences hid,
My sin concealing in my secret breast,
34 Because I feared the rabble multitude,
Or scorn of families[38] affrighted me,
So that I kept my place and went not forth—
35 (O had I one to hear me now;
Behold my sign[39]—let Shaddai answer me;
Mine adversary—let him write[40] his charge.
36 Would I not on my shoulder[41] take it up,
And bind it to me as my crown?
37 The number of my steps[42] would I declare,
Yes, as a prince, would I draw nigh to him.)
38 Against me, if my land hath cried,[43]
And all its furrows wept,—
39 If I have eaten of its strength for nought,
Or made its toilers pant[44] away their life;—
40 Instead of wheat let there come forth the thorn,
And noxious weeds in place of barley grow;
Job's words are ended,[45] [he protests no more].

"*his doors he opened*," *etc.;* but Job's vehemence confounds the persons.

[38] Ver. 34. **Scorn of families.** מִשְׁפָּחוֹת, *families*, is used for men of families,—men of rank, of birth, in distinction from the common multitude, or הָמוֹן רַבָּה. Some take כִּי as the apodosis: *Then let me dread, etc.;* but there is very little ground for this in the particle, and what follows, if taken as *apodosis*, would be beneath the gravity of impressive adjurations: "If I have committed these crimes, then let me fear the great multitude, and the contempt of families, and keep to myself." CONANT and others render המון רבה *the great assembly*, as though it meant some great judicial proceeding, but the words do not favor this. We expect something different, if there is to be an *apodosis* at all. Had none been expressed, it would still have been most impressive, as in other scriptures, where it is left in silence to the moral judgment. There is, however, an express apodosis, although it does not come in until several verses after. In his wrought-up state, the speaker breaks off again, as he had done twice before, with an impassioned cry that could not wait: O why continue such appeals, why vindicate myself instead of calling on my accusers for their proofs,—and this leads immediately to what follows, ver. 35, "O had I one to hear me now."

[39] Ver. 35. **Behold my sign.** *My signature*, or my writing; the letter תָּו being put for the alphabet, not for the sign of the cross as made by one who could not read nor write,—a custom which was long afterwards. Our translators regarded it as equivalent to תאוי my desire, but this makes a feeble sense, and is generally rejected.

[40] Ver. 35. **Let him write.** The preterite כָּתַב is really connected with יתן above: *O that he had written*—would that, *etc.*, equivalent to imperative, 3d pers.

[41] Ver. 36. **On my shoulder.** Not, as some think, because of its supposed weight, whether actual or moral; but rather to give it a conspicuous position; or it may have been some ancient form of challenge.

[42] Ver. 37. **The number of my steps,** or of my steppings, indicating a firm and steady walk. No irresolution: every step visible and capable of being counted. No shrinking and hiding away like Adam (see ver. 33). Very bold in Job, but very sublime. What there was in it that was wrong he sees afterwards, and most penitently confesses.

[43] Ver. 38. **Against me cries:** either on account of injustice in obtaining it, or on account of oppression to those who have cultivated its soil. The second idea is most evident in the second clause. Note again the Fut. Subjective, תזעק and יבכון, repeated, constant action. The weeping is that of the unrequited serfs, or hired laborers who have ploughed its furrows and watered them with their tears. This is strengthened by the word יַחַד, *altogether*, everywhere alike, o'er all its furrows. Compare Jas. v. 4, "Behold the hire of the laborers that have reaped your fields, it crieth out." There is taken another view, not so probable, yet still having much force, that the reference is directly to the harassed land itself, to which a greedy and ill-judging avarice would not allow its demanded rest. So CARYL (among other interpretations) with reference to Lev. xx. 4, 5, on the land enjoying its Sabbath. It is, too, an old idea, and Job may have heard of it, which makes the earth the representative of justice, on account of its paying back most faithfully what is given to it, and the labors bestowed upon it. Hence the explanation of the two names Θέμις and Γαῖα which ÆSCHYLUS treats as a mystery. *Prom. Vinct.* 209,

οὐκ ἅπαξ μόνον Θέμις
Καὶ Γαῖα, πολλῶν ὀνομάτων μορφὴ μία.
Justice and Earth, one form of many names.

This idea of earth's justice and impartiality is finely brought out by Virgil, Georgic., II., 460:

Fundit humo facilem victum JUSTISSIMA TELLUS.

It is very poetical, this representing the *just* Earth as weeping for the injustice done to her. It is, however, no less so if we regard the passage as referring to the laborers. The two ideas are closely connected.

[44] Ver. 39. **Or made its toilers pant.** This may not sound well to those accustomed to a different mode of translating. DELITZSCH and others render it: "I have caused the soul of its possessors to expire." (So E. V.) The verb הפיח is also used to denote scornful treatment, as in Ps. x. 5, "all his enemies he puffeth at them," יָפִיחַ בָּהֶם; the preposition there making but very little difference in the general idea. It might perhaps be rendered here, "I have blown away, puffed at, treated as wind, or worthless, the breath (that is, the laboring, panting breath) of the laborers." These may properly be called בְּעָלֶיהָ from the idea of some right in the soil derived from having mingled with it their sweat and tears.

[45] Ver. 40. **Thus end.** These words have been generally regarded as merely a note made by the author, or some very early transcriber. There is cited, as a similar case, the words Ps. lxxii. 10: "The prayers of David the son of Jesse, are ended." There is no doubt that this was an early practice of translators and transcribers. A formula just like it is attached to the books of the Peschito Syriac Version, Old Testament and New; very much as *finis* used to be put to the end of English books. There is, however, an impressive propriety in this last clause regarded as the closing words of Job himself, and his using his own name this once adds to its force. As though he had said: "This is my vindica-

tion; I have done; you will hear from Job no more." It is true, he speaks afterwards, but it is under remarkable circumstances, xl. 3; xlii. 1–6, and even then he seems to have reference to some former close he had made (אחת דִּבַּרְתִּי) and repeats again: "I will *add* no more."

If, however, it be decided that these words are put to the end of the chapter by a third person, either author or *early* transcriber, it would seem almost conclusive against the idea that in that ancient time there immediately followed the address of Jehovah, chap. xxxviii. Such an immediate answer from *the* thundercloud (though no such cloud or storm had been mentioned) would have rendered them impertinent and superfluous as a note to the reader. They bear the intimation that Job's part in the drama is, for the present, closed, but only as suggestive of other human speakers (whether the old or some new one) who are to follow. Thus it furnishes a preparation for the speech of Elihu. If in our present copies, chap. xxxviii., followed directly after ch. xxxi., we could not help feeling the incongruity of such a note, so made by author or transcriber, and it would long ago have been rejected as most decidedly out of place.

Chapter XXXII.

1 So these three men ceased from answering Job because he was wise in his own
2 eyes. Then was aroused the zeal of Elihu,[1] son of Barachel the Buzite, of the
family of Ram.[2] Against Job was his zeal aroused because he accounted him-
3 self more[3] just than God. And against his three friends was his zeal kindled,
4 because they had found no answer, and yet had condemned Job. Now Elihu
5 had waited till Job had spoken, because they were older than he. And Elihu
saw that there was no answer in the mouth of the three men, and his zeal was
6 kindled. Then answered Elihu, the son of Barachel the Buzite, and said:

I am but young in years,
And ye are very old.
It was for this I shrunk[4] away,
And feared to show you what I thought.
7 For days should speak, I said,
And multitude of years should wisdom teach.
8 But surely there's a[5] spirit dwells in man,
'Tis Shaddai's breath that gives intelligence.
9 Not always wise, the men of many[6] years;
Elders there are who fail to know the right.
10 For this I said: "O listen now to me,
Let me, too, show my knowledge, even me."[7]

[1] Ver. 2. **Elihu.** On the genuineness of this Elihu portion, see Introd. Theism of the Book, pa. 89, and especially the marginal note, pp. 26, 27.

[2] Ver. 2. **Family of Ram.** The genealogy of Elihu is here given, but not a word is said about the way and time of his introduction into the Drama. It is left to the reader's imagination, along with other things, such as the probable place of the dialogue, the number of days and nights that may have been occupied with the discussion. How many persons may have come and gone during this time, or been present throughout, cannot be told. There is something in the xix. 13–15–19 that seems to intimate an occasional presence and departure of kinsmen and others. It seems, however, almost certain that if some later hand had wholly interpolated this episode, he would have explained, in some way, the connection, had it been only to make it seem natural and consistent. The original writer would have felt no such responsibility, as he would have feared no such charge of inconsistency. He would have felt that the story was his own, to give in his own way, or as he received it, without an obligation to fill up any blanks or omissions as others might conceive them.

[3] Ver. 2. **More just than God.** Umbreit renders: Weil er sich fur gerecht hielt *vor* Gott. Job, he says, had never claimed to be more just than God. Still his language suggested such an inference, and such a charge against him on the part of Elihu, even though a mistaken one. Delitzsch renders it, auf Kosten Gottes—"at the expense of God."

[4] Ver. 6. **I shrunk away.** The primary idea of זחל is that of an animal that creeps, or winds like a serpent, into his hole, and is reluctant to come out again. The cognate דחל becomes the common Syriac verb to fear instead of ירא.

[5] Ver. 8. **A spirit.** The lowest and most naturalizing exegesis is compelled to give רוח here a high spiritual sense. If not the Divine Spirit, it is that in man which is most akin to it—the rational principle, or *the Reason*, in the highest sense that can be given to the word. See Gen. ii. 7.

[6] Ver. 9. **Many years.** רב is taken by most commentators with reference to age. The רַבִּים are not the great in rank or magnitude, but the *πολυχρόνιοι*—still, however, carrying the idea of superiority, as Conant says.

[7] Ver. 10. **Even me.** Nothing can be more unjust, and, at the same time, more uncritical than the charge some German commentators delight to make against Elihu as an incoherent, as well as forward and impertinent babbler. He does, indeed, seem to repeat himself, but it is this very sincere diffidence that causes it. They are neither affected nor cringing apologies he makes. It is the hesitating feeling of a thoughtful yet modest young man, deeply interested in the discussions to which he has been intently listening, conscious of having something to say which is worth their hearing, and yet with a true reverence for persons not only older, but esteemed wiser, than himself. The introduction and the speech that follows are certainly most characteristic; and if this be proof of artistic merit, it may be said that, in this respect, there is nothing surpassing it in the drama.

11 Lo! I have waited while ye spake;
To all your reasonings have I given[8] heed,
Whilst[9] ye were trying words.
12 Yes, unto you with earnest thought I look,
And lo, there's no one that convinces Job,—
No one of you who truly answers him.
13 Beware [10] of saying, *we* have wisdom[11] found;
(Know ye) 'tis God that crushes him, not man.
14 At me he hath not marshalled[12] words,
Nor with your speeches will I answer him.
15 All broken down, they fail to make reply;
(Some power) hath taken[13] all their words away.
16 And still I waited, though[14] they did not speak,
But silent stood,[15] and offered no reply.
17 I too[16] would answer, I would bear my part;
Let me, too, show my thought.
18 For I am filled with words;
The spirit in my breast[17] constraineth me.
19 My heart[18] is full, as with unvented wine;
Like vessels new that are about to burst.
20 Yes, I would speak[19] that I may find relief—
Open my lips, and give it utterance.
21 O let me not regard the face of man;
To no one let me flattering titles[20] give.

[8] Ver. 11. **Given heed.** Clearly intimating that he had been present during the whole discussion.

[9] Ver. 11. **Whilst.** עַד, like ἕως in Greek, may mean *until*, *as long as*, or *whilst*. The latter seems preferable here as more suited to the context.

[10] Ver. 13. **Beware,** פֶּן implying caution with an ellipsis of some verb—*lest ye do it*—that is, *take care, look out lest* ye do it. Just so the Greeks u-e *μή* and sometimes ὅπως, Latin *ne*. See another example Gen. iii. 22, פֶּן יִשְׁלַח: "lest he send forth his hand," *etc.*

[11] Ver. 13. **We have wisdom found:** that is, discovered the truth in Job's case. Elihn's language in the second clause is a denial of this: You have not found out the secret; it is one of God's mysteries. He crushes him, not man, or in the way of, or after the notions of men.

[12] Ver. 14. **Marshalled words.** Bitter, hostile, controversial words. set in battle array, as it were. Such is the force of ערך. "There is nothing in the way of my answering Job carefully and candidly."

[13] Ver. 15. (**Some power**) **hath taken.** Here is another example of what grammarians unmeaningly call the use of the active for the passive. See note on כִּגְּוּ vii. 3, with reference to Ps. xlix. 15; Luke xii. 20, and other similar places. The same general explanation answers here. Most comm nly. as we have seen, there is, in such cases, something terrible or revolting in the subject, or agent, which suppresses mention. Again, it is something perplexing, astounding. inexplicable, suggesting the idea of strange, mysterious influences. It would be just the place here for such an idiom: "Something seems to have taken away their power of speech;" referring to their strange and protonged silence. The words in brackets are an attempt to give the idea implied in this particular idiom. SCHLOTTMANN would explain it by Gen. xii. 8; xxvi. 22, where וַיַּעְתֵּק gets the sense of *moving on*, from the action of putting up the pegs that fastened down the tent. Hence he renders it, not passively, but intransitively: das Wort war ihnen entwichen, "the world *was gone* from them; *it moved away*." This, however, seems like putting a great strain upon the metaphor. It may apply to a tent; but it would be very strange as used of words.

[14] Ver. 16. **Though they did not speak.** כִּי as causal, or as giving a reason, may be taken in two ways, according as the context demands. It may give a reason for, and then it is rendered *for* or *because*. Or it may be a reason against, and then it must be rendered *though*, or *notwithstanding*. See the numerous examples of the latter given by NOLDIUS.

[15] Ver. 16. **But silent stood.** The particle כִּי is repeated here, but the asyndetic rendering is more forcible in English, and therefore more true to the spirit of the passage. This picture of Elihu is most faithful to the life, and could hardly have come from anything else than an actual life scene. The young man has been intently listening. His breast is alternately swelled with indignation at the treatment Job experiences from his professed friends, and with wondering awe at some of the bold language of the sufferer. Yet still he constrains himself. Even after they had ceased speaking, the reverential feeling felt to be due to his elders holds him silent, although his thoughts and emotions are becoming irrepressible. It is a very frigid criticism that overlooks the exquisite naturalness of this scene, takes no heed of the speaker's unaffected *embarrassment*, and treats him as a mere stammerer, repeating over and over again, his platitudes and tautologies.

[16] Ver. 17. **I, too,** אַף אָנִי. It recurs twice in the two clauses, not as the language of egotism, but of sincere modesty, hesitating, embarrassed, repeating, but with a consciousness of having truth that had been overlooked, and an irrepressible desire to utter it.

[17] Ver. 18—[18] Ver. 19. **Breast—heart.** The most faithful rendering of בֶּטֶן in these places is that which modernizes them, that is, translates by transferring the idiom as well as the words. The Hebrews and the Arabians both use this word (commonly rendered the belly) for the most interior seat of thought and feeling, like the *bowels* and the *reins*. See Note [2], ver. 2, ch. xv., and the references there made to Prov. xxii. 27; Heb. iv. 12.

[19] Ver. 20. **Yes I would speak.** Paragogic or optative future.

[20] Ver. 21. **Flattering titles give.** The Hebrew כנה is almost identical with the Arabic verb of the same consonants, which is very common in the sense of naming, especially used of surnames, *cognomina*, or titles; hence denoting metonymy, or the expressing a thing by some other

22 I know not how to flatter; were it so,
Then would my Maker take me soon away.

name than its own, or the usual one. In this way the noun becomes in Arabic a grammatical and rhetorical technic. So also among the Rabbinical Grammarians כִּנּוּי is the word for *epithet, periphrase, pronoun.*

Chapter XXXIII.

1 And now,[1] O Job, but listen to my speech.—
Thine ear attentive to my every word.
2 Behold I have unbarred[2] my mouth;
My tongue gives utterance[3] distinct.
3 My words—they are my soul's sincerity;[4]
The truth I know, my lips do purely[5] speak.

4 God's spirit made me man;[6]
'Twas Shaddai's breath that gave me life.
5 If thou canst do it, answer me;
Array[7] thy words against me, take thy stand.
6 To God[8] belongs my being, like[9] thine own;

[1] Ver. 1. **And now, O Job.** Still the excusing, deferential tone so becoming in the young man. אוּלָם a strong adversative particle,—οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλα, LXX.—notwithstanding my youth. Delitzsch, Jedoch aber. **My every word** כָּל־דְּבָרָי: "As though he had said, I hope I shall not speak one needless word,—not a word beside the business;" Caryl.

[2] Ver. 2. **Unbarred my mouth.** Justice to this wise and godly young man, whom some critics treat so injuriously, demands an interpretation of his words that will not make them a flat tautology. such as he never could have intended. As shown by the context, פָּתַחְתִּי here means more than simply opening. It is an unclosing of what had been shut or barred. Caryl gives tho key to it: "the phrase opening the mouth, here importeth that he had been long silent." See Note [15], ver. 16, xxxii. Unable to repress (see chap. xxxii. 18, 19) he opens it at last. The emphasis we have given to the word is justified by the particle הִנֵּה calling attention to the fact of his venturing to speak at all in the presence of his elders.

[3] Ver. 2. **Gives utterance distinct.** The second clause, rendered as is done by E. V. and others: "*my tongue hath spoken in my mouth,*" or *my palate*, would make a like tautology, or rather empty platitude. "How should a man speak but with his mouth," asks Caryl in view of such a rendering. Umbreit remarks most characteristically: Es ist hier zu deutlich dass der Verfasser unseres Buches den Elihu absichtlich als einen eingebildeten Schwätzer sich geberden lasst. He does not go with those who reject the Elihu portion, as Ewald does, but thinks that the author meant to represent the speaker as talking like a conceited fool. Our old Puritan commentator shows a keener insight into such shades of difference and matters of emphasis than many modern critics who underrate or wholly ignore him. He regards "speaking in or by the palate" as a phrase for well considered utterance, or the use of carefully chosen words. The idea is well supported from the fact that the palate is the organ of taste as well as of utterance, and that so universally in language is there this transfer of idea from the sense *taste* to the mental *discernment* (*Lat. sapio, sapiens,* Heb. טַעַם): "So saith Elihu, my mouth hath spoken in my palate, I *tasted* my words before I spake them." The word tongue, however, suggests another idea. The palate, in connection with the tongue and its motions, is an organ of articulate speech in distinction from the confused and the stammering. So Cocceius: *disertis verbis, distincte et enucleate.* Notwithstanding his diffidence and hesitation, he gets confidence at last to speak distinctly, and with what wisdom, this chapter and the following clearly show, notwithstanding the disparagement of Umbreit and Ewald. The attempts to give force to the language, aside from the two ideas mentioned, avail but little to save the tautology. Says Delitzsch: "He has already opened his mouth, his tongue is already in motion,—they are circumstantial statements that solemnly inaugurate what follows." Schlottmann's comment is to a similar effect. Dillmann, "die Zunge in Gaumen denotes that he is just ready to speak," like the bow to spring, *etc.*

[4] Ver. 3. **My soul's sincerity.** Elihu is like Job in the consciousness of his sincerity, but his diffidence greatly adds to the interest of the picture.

[5] Ver. 3. **Purely.** בָּרוּר taken adverbially may carry an intellectual or a moral sense,—speaking clear and distinct, or sincere and true. The last suits the passage best, though both may be included.

[6] Ver. 4. **Made me man.** Elihu undoubtedly takes the words according to the obvious idea of Gen. ii. 7. It is not mere breath, or breathing. It is the manner of making him specifically man, as something distinct from the formation of what may be called the human physical, whether by processes of typical growth, or by evolution, or by direct mechanical creation. "And God breathed into him and man became," or, he "became man, a living soul." Other animals are called נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה *breath of life*, but they become animated from the general life of nature, or the רוּחַ "that brooded upon the face of the waters." But it was in a more divine or special way, or by a peculiar fiat, that man became נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה. The emphasis is on the manner of becoming. *Thus* he became man. This higher life directly from God is his *specific* distinction, that which makes the species אָדָם, *homo*, in distinction from other animal tribes who are nothing but animals. See Lange, Gen. Am. Ed., pp. 174, 211, Marginal Notes.

[7] Ver. 5. **Array thy words.** See xxxii. 14, עָרַךְ מִלִּין.

[8] Ver. 6. **To God my being.** לָאֵל. Renan, *Devant Dieu je suis ton egal.* But this can hardly be what Elihu means to assert, and it would have little association with the second clause. Literally, *Godward*, if we would imitate the conciseness of the Hebrew; *as regards God*, or in respect to the Divine side of our common being.

[9] Ver. 6. **Like thine own.** כְּפִיךָ. The rendering of E. V.: *according to thy wish.* or *thy mouth, etc.*, comes from regarding פִּי, כְּ as separate and taking it literally. It is, however, only an intense form of the comparative particle

And I, too, was divided[10] from the clay.
7 Behold, my terror shall not frighten thee,
Nor heavy shall my hand[11] upon thee press.
8 But surely thou hast spoken in mine ears;
The sound of words I hear [they seem to say]:
9 "A man without transgression—pure am I;
Yes, I am clean[12]—I have no sin.
10 Against me, Lo He seeketh grounds[13] of strife;
He counts me as his foe;
11 My feet He putteth in the stocks,
And watcheth all my ways."
12 Behold, in this, I answer thee, thou art not just;
For know, Eloah is too[14] great for man.
13 O why against Him dost thou make complaint,
That by no word of His[15] he answereth?
14 For God *does* speak—He speaketh once[16]—
Again, again—though man regard it not;
15 In dreams, in visions of the night,
In slumberings on the bed;
When falls on men the overwhelming[17] sleep.

occurring in a number of places in the old, and becoming quite common in the later Hebrew. כ and כפי are to each other like ὡς and ὥσπερ in Greek (*as*, and *just as*). Our translators were led to this to justify their rendering of לאל, "*in God's stead*," or as one representing him. But this is without authority in the usage of the preposition ל. DELITZSCH, ZÖCKLER, CONANT and others render: "I am of God as thou art," which is in substance the idea conveyed by the words employed: We stand to God in the same way and in both respects—soul from His spirit—body from the clay, or as a "*lump taken from the clay*." GESENIUS, *Sicut tu a Deo (creatus sum)*.

[10] Ver. 6. **Divided.** The Hebrew קרץ is used of the *biting* of the lips, Prov. xvi. 30, of the *winking* of the eyes, Prov. vi. 13; x. 10; Ps. xxxv. 19. Hence Lexicographers deduce as a primary sense that of *cutting*, which connects it with verbs of forming or *creating*. So GESENIUS regards it, *De luto decerptus sum et ego*, imagine a figulo repetita qui vasculum formaturus luti partem de massa decerpet. Hence from it a noun in Syriac denoting a crumb, *frustum*, or piece of anything. This will be more easily accepted when we bear in mind how much this idea of *division*, separating one thing, or one element, from another, enters into the language of Genesis i. Each step is a parting of something from that with which it before was blended—a rising *above*, or an *evolution from*. We need not be in the least afraid of this kind of language, of which some scientists are now so fond, as long as we hold to the idea of a commencing *fiat*, or of an outgoing word. Whether through longer or shorter stages, man's physical, man's animal or earthly, is a *cutting*, out of nature; a Divine elevation, not a *saltus* or *leap*.

[11] Ver. 7. **My hand.** אֶכֶף occurs only here, but its etymological affinity to כַּף, and the parallelism presented to xiii. 21, where the second clause is precisely like the first here, and כַּף stands in it just as אֶכֶף stands here, would seem to put the matter beyond doubt. Of the ancient authorities the Targum and the Syriac give it the sense of *burden*, connecting it probably with כָּפַף to *bend*, or *bow down*. The LXX. render it *hand*, and with that agrees the great Jewish authority KIMCHI. RASCHI renders it כפייתי, and explains it by Prov. xvi. 26, אָכַף עָלָיו פִּיהוּ.

[12] Ver. 9. **Clean.** חַף has the sense of *smoothness*, from the primary idea of *friction* in the verb חפף. Hence חוף, *the shore of the sea*, the beach worn clean by the washing of the waters.

[13] Ver. 10. **Grounds of strife,** תְּנוּאוֹת. See the word and its root, Numb. xiv. 34; xxxii. 7. Elihu is now pressing Job with allusions to some of his rash speeches. Says CARYL: "Having ended his sweet, ingenious, insinuating preface, he falls roundly to the business, and begins a very sharp charge."

[14] Ver. 12. **Too great for man.** This rendering answers well to the comparative מִן, and yet is not the same as the proposition: God is greater than man." As a naked fact, or truism, that could hardly be what Elihu meant to assert; but rather that God's acknowledged greatness made such language as Job had used, very unseemly. He is too *great a* being, to say nothing of his holiness and other attributes, to be addressed in that manner. So DELITZSCH: Denn zu erhaben ist Eloah dem Sterblichen.

[15] Ver. 13. **By no word of his.** More literally, *that not a word of his he answereth*, making דבריו the direct object of יענה, as 1 Kings xviii. 21, וְלֹא עָנוּ דָּבָר, *and they answered not a word* (the same Isai. xxxvi. 21; Jerem. xlii. 4; xliv. 20). This is the rendering of SCHLOTTMANN:.

Warum hast mit ihm du gehadert,
dass kein einzig Wort er erwiedre—

making a universal negative according to the Hebrew idiom. E. V. and the older commentators generally, render כי (2d clause) *for* or *because:* "Why strive, *since* he giveth no account," *etc.* The view adopted by DELITZSCH, SCHLOTTMANN, ZÖCKLER, *et al.*, making כי denote the ground of Job's charge (why complain *that* he does not) harmonizes better with the verse following. Along with this view of כי, however, DELITZSCH and ROSENMUELLER take דבריו as denoting, generally, *deeds, dealings*. But here, too, the rendering of SCHLOTTMANN is to be preferred for the same reason, or as agreeing better with the peculiar diction of ver. 14. Job complained that God did not answer him,—did not speak—xix. 7; xxx. 20. Elihu says God *does* speak to man. There is also some discussion respecting the pronoun in דבריו. HIRZEL would refer it to אנוש, man generally. Some would understand it of Job, as though Elihu, in his earnestness, suddenly changed to the 3d person (*his* for *thine*), forgetting himself and speaking *of* Job instead of *to* him. The rendering given has the least difficulty. It makes Job's charge and Elihu's answer, each more clear and direct.

[16] Ver. 14. **Speaketh once,** באחת. DELITZSCH renders, "*in one way;*" but it comes to the same thing. As opposed to this בִּשְׁתַּיִם means *more than once—repeatedly.* Comp. xl. 5.

[17] Ver. 15. **Overwhelming sleep.** GESENIUS makes רדם an onomatope, from the *snoring* (*sterior*) of heavy sleep—comparing it in this respect with the Latin *dormio*, and the

16 Then opens He their ear,
And seals the warning given;
17 To make[18] man put away his deed,
To hide from man[19] the way of pride.
18 That from the pit He may keep back his soul,
His life from passing on the spear.
19 With anguish is he chastened on his bed—
His every[20] bone—a never-ceasing pain ;
20 So that his very life[21] abhorreth bread,
His appetite[22] rejects the once[23]-loved food.
21 His flesh, from sight, it wastes away ;
His bones laid bare, before concealed[24] from view.
22 Unto perdition[25] draweth nigh his soul ;
His life awaits the messengers of[26] death.

23 And is there then an angel[27] on his side,—
The interceding one,—of thousands chief,—
To make it known to man,[28] His righteousness;
24 So does He show him grace, and say :
"Deliver him from going down to death ;
A ransom[29] I have found."
25 Moist as in childhood[30] grows his flesh again,
And to his youthful day does he return.

Greek δαρθάνω. Sleep, however, thus regarded, is not favorable to the clear undisturbed dreaming or vision here demanded. Better take as primary the sense which the Niphal has, Dan. viii. 18; x. 9; Psalm lxxvi. 7, of *awe, astonishment* (VULG. *consternatus*) denoting a trance-like state. See the note on this word iv. 13, and the reference there to the Introduction. Here it may be less clairvoyant, but it clearly denotes something different from ordinary slumber, and that ordinary dreaming which comes from a semi-consciousness of something affecting us from the *outer* world around us. On the other hand, the dreams here spoken of are supposed to come from within the soul itself, as from its deeper being, or as the voice of God in it, or from some plane *above*, when the sleep is of such a nature that the outer world is wholly excluded.

[18] Ver. 17. **To make man put away.** The syntactical harmony of this verse is preserved, without any change of subject, by giving to the Hiphil הסיר a double, or an intensive causal force, such as it will bear, and which the context seems to demand. It may thus be regarded as having a double object, אדם and מעשה.

[19] Ver. 18. **To hide from man.** The hero or mighty man (גבר in distinction from אדם). Some ellipsis seems demanded with גֵוָה, such as *look, way*, or *deed* of pride. It seems to resemble the Greek ὕβρις, denoting *haughty, reckless action*, rather than mere *feeling*. So מעשה in the 1st clause would denote a *bad deed*. See Note [12], ver. 11, chap. xxxi., on Heb. זִמָּה, Lat. *facinus*, Greek ἔργον. SCHLOTTMANN gives scheiden, to *divide, separate*, as the rendering of יְכַסֶּה, but that seems to destroy the metaphor—*covering, hiding, veiling*, putting it away from his sight, or giving it a different appearance.

[20] Ver. 19. **His every bone.** The Holem vowel in רוֹב shows the true rendering, making it exactly like iv. 14. The other (רִיב) demands a rendering (*strife*) too metaphorical for the simplicity of Elihu's language. It is, too, of an artificial sentimental kind, supported by no use of רִיב, if that be the true reading, in any other place in the Hebrew Bible. It always means a judicial strife, which would make a very far-fetched metaphor here, is applied to a pain in the bones. The other reading moreover, is made very clear by comparison with iv. 14—*the multitude of his bones:* an expressive mode of saying, every bone of the many bones in his body, great and small. Anatomy reveals how numerous they are, and, before precise anatomical knowledge, the number seemed, perhaps, still greater. It should be remembered, too, how abrupt the style is. Elihu seems moved by his own description, and his language becomes passionate, leaving out the verbal copula: *His every bone—pain unceasing.*

[21] Ver. 20. **His very life.** This use of חַיָּה, *life* for soul, is unusual, but the parallelism with נפש makes it clear. It is meant to be intensive: the very *life* which the food would sustain rejects it.

[22] Ver. 20. **Appetite.** So נפש is used Prov. vi. 30; x. 3, 27; xxvii. 7; Isai. lv. 2.

[23] Ver. 20. **Once-loved food.** Literally, *food of desire,*—choice, favorite food.

[24] Ver. 21. **Before concealed from sight.** So the VULG. renders לֹא רֻאּוּ as a relative or descriptive clause (*which are not seen*). In like manner JUNIUS and TREMELLIUS, and most of the old commentators. DELITZSCH, SCHLOTTMANN, EWALD, take רֻאּוּ directly: *they are not seen.* They either connect it with שֻׁפּוּ, making two distinct assertions: *his bones are bare*, they are *not seen;* which seems a contradiction, unless by *bare* is meant wasted away, and so disappearing, which is not an easy view; or they take the Ketib here, שפי, as the noun subject: seine verstörten glieder, DELITZSCH; seine dürres Gebein, SCHLOTTMANN; ses os dènudés s'évanouissent, RENAN. The old way of taking it as a relative clause is much easier than in some other places where that method of interpretation is freely adopted, but the strong argument for it is the harmony it makes in the parallelism: His flesh *once seen*, so plump and fair, now wasted out of view; his bones once closely covered by the flesh, now *projecting*, thrusting themselves out to view, as it were, "looking and staring at him," as in Ps. xxii. 18. UMBREIT very concisely and clearly: und kahl wird sein Gebein das man vorher nicht sehen konnte. For שֻׁפּוּ see, in Niphal, Isai. xiii. 2—used of a mountain bare and *projecting.* The corresponding Syriac and Arabic words have the same meaning.

[25] Ver. 22. **Perdition.** שחת means more than the grave here, or *corruption.* The idea is not distinct, but it is that of some great loss,—something terrible connected with the thought of the going out of the life.

[26], [27], [28], [29] Vers. 22, 23, 24; see EXCURSUS XI. in the Addenda, pp. 208, 209.

[30] Ver. 25. **In childhood.** מ here in מִנֹּעַר is not comparative but causal. DELITZSCH.

26 He prays to God and God accepts his prayer,
To let him see His face with joy,
And thus give back to man his righteousness.[31]

27 It is his song[32] to men, and thus it says:
"I sinned, I made my way perverse,[33]
And it was not requited[34] me;
28 My soul hath He redeemed from passing to the grave,
My life that it may yet behold the light."

29 Behold! in all these ways, so dealeth God,
Time after time,[35] and times again, with man;
30 His soul to rescue from the grave,
That it may joy[36] in light,—the light of those who live.

31 Attend, O Job, give ear to me;
Be still[37] that I may speak.
32 If thou hast words, then answer me;
Speak out; my wish is thy defence.
33 If not, then give to me thine ear;
Be still, if I may wisely counsel thee.

[31] Ver. 26. **His righteousness.** *Man's righteousness* objectively; but the righteousness of God, to whom the pronoun may be referred in the sense of God's dealings with man *in return* (וַיָּשֶׁב) for man's dealings towards him,—or righteousness and mercy for unrighteousness. See remarks on יְשֻׁרוּן Ver. 23, in Excursus XI., p. 210.

[32] Ver. 27. **It is his song.** יָשֹׁר from שִׁיר — שׁוּר; *he chants or sings.* It is now the commonly admitted view of the word. This deliverance becomes his song of holy rejoicing. Thereby as the Psalmist does, he tells men, "what the Lord hath done for his soul," at the same time most humbly confessing his sin. Compare also xxxv. 10; *Songs in the night*—or season of sorrow.

[33] Ver. 27. **Make my way perverse.** Lit., *pervert*, or make crooked the *straight*.

[34] Ver. 27. **Requited.** שָׁוָה: *make like* or *equal*, hence the sense of *retribution.*

[35] Ver. 29. **Time after time.** The *dual* פַּעֲמַיִם. Lit., *two strokes, blow after blow*, thus coming to be used for changes, turns (*vices*) *vicissitudes*—שָׁלֹשׁ פַּעֲמַיִם *two times*, —three times—repeatedly.

[36] Ver. 30. **That it may joy in light.** DELITZSCH: Und mein Leben labt sich am Lichte. Compare the expressions Ecclesiastes and elsewhere, in which seeing the light is equivalent to life. See INT. THEISM., p. 5. לֵאוֹר for לְהֵאוֹר, Inf. Niphal—*be made light.*

[37] Ver. 31. **Be still.** The language would seem to intimate some impatience,—a look or gesture of dissent or appeal. There is much in this speech of Elihu that suggests the idea of a real life scene. See INT. THEISM, pa. 39.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

1 And Elihu continued his reply and said:

2 Hear, O ye wise, my words;
Ye knowing ones give me your ear.
3 It is the ear that trieth speech,
As tastes the palate[1] food.
4 Let us then make the right our choice,[2]
And aim to know between us what is good.

5 For Job saith, "I am innocent;
'Tis God who puts away my cause.

[1] Ver. 3. **Food.** Lit., *to eat.* לֶאֱכֹל what is good to eat—not, *by tasting*, as DELITZSCH takes it.

[2] Ver. 4. **Our choice.** בָּחַר, *to examine*, but in order *to choose.* So the Greek δοκιμάζέν καὶ τὸ καλὸν κατέχειν. 1 Thess. v. 20. The paragogic futures, in both clauses, express *aim, desire.*

6 Against my right shall I speak what is false?
Sore is my wound, but from no crime of mine."
7 Where is the mighty[3] man like Job?
Who like the water drinketh scorning down;
8 Who[4] joins the malefactor's band,
And walks the way of wicked men.
9 For he has said: "It does no good to man,
That he should take delight in God."
10 To this,[5] ye wise of heart, my answer hear:
Away the thought;[6] O far be God from wickedness;
O far be evil from the Almighty One.
11 For sure, the work of man, to him will He requite,
And make him find according to his way.
12 Yea, verily,[7] God will not do the wrong;
The Almighty One cannot pervert the right.
13 Who gave[8] to Him the charge of earth,
And on it built the world?
14 Should He think only of Himself,[9]—
His breath and spirit (from the world) withdraw,—
15 All flesh together would expire,[10]
And man go back to dust.
16 O could'st thou see it![11] list to this,
Give ear unto my words.
17 A hater of the right; does he (the world) restrain?[12]
The Just, the Mighty—Him shalt thou condemn?[13]
18 Even to a king shall one say Belial?[14]

[3] ver. 7. **Mighty man.** גִּבֵּר. Elihu seems to have some admiration of Job's bold, *heroic* bearing, though censuring him. לַעַג may refer to his haughty repelling of the charges made against him, or to his mode of speaking of God.

[4] Ver. 8. **Who joins,** *etc.* Elihu does not charge this literally, but only as the tendency of Job's language.

[5] Ver. 10. **To this.** לָכֵן is more special than עַל כֵּן. It is a reply to something just said, and prompting an answer that cannot be suppressed. See the example, chap. xx. 2, where it denotes Zophar's haste to reply to Job's bold speech at the close of the preceding chapter: לכן, *for so—to such a speech as that*, I make haste to answer. This is implied in שמעו: *hear what I have to say to this—propter-ea.*

[6] Ver. 10. **Away the thought.** This is the answer he is impatient to give. חלילה, O profanum; a vehement protest. The best translation is that which gives it most strongly and clearly without attempting to imitate the almost untranslatable Hebrew construction. The thought of a God of wickedness is not to be tolerated for a moment. The idea of Omnipotence connected with that of injustice is still more horrible. It is to be protested against, not argued about.

[7] Ver. 11. **Yea verily.** אַף אָמְנָם. The strongest particle of asseveration = N. T., ἀμὴν ἀμήν.

[8] Ver. 13. **Who gave.** "A mere viceroy might do wrong, but the Supreme Ruler is in a different position." So DELITZSCH and others. The argument, however, seems to be a higher one. It is simply the a priori idea of the moral sense. We cannot reason about it. So Abraham, Gen. xviii. 25: *Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?* חָלִלָה לְּךָ, *far be it from Thee, Lord.*

[9] Ver. 14. **Of himself.** E. V. and others regarded אֵלָיו as referring to man. ישים לב, put his mind upon him, (προσέχειν νοῦν τινί), that is in the way of judgment. The interpretation given above is that of GROTIUS, and has since been generally followed. See SCHLOTTMANN, DELITZSCH, *et al.* The statement is in proof of the Divine benevolence. His continuation of the universe is an evidence of it.

[10] Ver. 15. **Would expire.** See Ps. civ. 29: "When thou takest away their breath (principle of life) they expire, (יִגְוָעוּן *gasp*) and return to their dust." The source of life must be the fountain of all goodness.

[11] Ver. 16. **O could'st thou see it!** DELITZSCH regards בינה as the Imperative verb instead of a noun; but thinks the joining with it of the אם, makes it equivalent to אם תבין. E. V., and others, took it as a noun; but thus viewed it comes to about the same thing either way. It does not imply a reflection on Job as the E. V. rendering seems to do, but only an earnest wish that he could see things rightly. Elihu is very *zealous* and, at the same time, *tender*. This gives interest to his seeming repetitions, as it divests them of that tautological, prattling character, which some are fond of ascribing to him. It is a sufficient answer to all this jaunty criticism, that nowhere in the book, except in the address of the Almighty, are there to be found grander ethical and theological ideas: God *cannot* do wrong; it cannot be a despiser of right that binds the world in harmony; His very continuance of man and the world show this; O that Job's sufferings would allow him to see it. Nothing in the speeches of Eliphaz and Zophar comes up to this.

[12] Ver. 17. **Restrain.** חבש is not the usual word for *governing*, but such a sense here would be analogous to the use of the similar word, עצר to *restrain*, 1 Sam. x. 17, and אסר, to *bind*, Ps. cv. 22. In the usual sense of binding, which it has both in Hebrew and in Arabic, it would be very appropriate here. Elihu has reference to God's government in the most general sense, as the binding power of the universe. Injustice here would be anarchy and dissolution in the moral, as it would ultimately be in the physical world.

[13] Ver. 17. **Condemn.** תרשיע, *pronounce wicked.*

[14] Ver. 18. **Belial.** בְּלִיָּעַל. The idea is best expressed by keeping the well understood epithet—worthlessness.

To (earthly) powers, O wickedness?
19 There's One who favors not the face of kings,
Who knoweth not the rich before the poor;
For His own hands did make them all alike.
20 So suddenly they die (these mighty ones);
At midnight rage the people—rush[15] they on—
And take away the strong; 'tis by no (human) hand.
21 For sure His eyes are on the ways of men;
He seeth all their steps.
22 No darkness[16] is there, yea, no shade of death,
Where men of evil deeds can hide themselves.
23 He needeth[17] not repeated scrutiny,
When man to God in judgment comes.
24 He breaks the strong, in ways we cannot trace;[18]
And setteth others in their stead.
25 To this end knoweth He their works;
He overturns them in the[19] night—they're crushed.
26 [Again],—He smites the wicked as they[20] stand,
In open place, where all behold the sight.
27 It is for this, because they turned aside,
And disregarded all His ways;
28 To bring before His[21] face the poor man's cry,
That He should hear the plaint of the oppressed.

29 When He gives quiet, who can then[22] disturb?

[15] Ver. 20. **Rush they on.** וְיַעַבְרוּ, *and pass on;* the rapid motion of a transported mob. It has also the sense of *attack*, as Nah. iii. 19; Ps. cxxiv. 4; Job xiii. 13, *etc.*, in which cases, however, it is generally followed by עַל here unnecessary because the object is so clearly implied in the other verbs. Some take יסירו passively with אביר for its passive subject. The other way is the easier, as well as the more vivid. The sudden and stormy rising of the people, (יְגֹעֲשׁוּ, VULGATE: *in media nocte turbabuntur populi, et pertransibunt, et auferent violentem*) is the cause of the tyrant's dethronement. And yet, although it is the popular commotion which makes the visible and immediate cause, it is truly the hand of God which we may regard as the remote and unseen agency. Comp. Ps. xvii. 14, 15: מִמְתִים יָדְךָ, *from men, thy hand*, מֵרָשָׁע חַרְבֶּךָ, *from the wicked thy sword.* The truth has often had its illustration in modern as well as in ancient times. That Elihu means to represent it as God's doing, notwithstanding His seeming neglect, or His forbearance, appears from the words לֹא בְיָד, which can hardly have any other meaning, and is confirmed by the language of the verse following.

[16] Ver. 22. **No darkness.** (Compare SOPHOCLES' *Œdip. Col.* 280:

φυγὴν δέ τοῦ
μήπω γενέσθαι φωτὸς ἀνοσίου βροτῶν.

[17] Ver. 23. **He needeth not,** *etc.* This is the substantial meaning of the verse as given by EWALD, and as it is well explained by RENAN:

Dieu n'a pas besoin de regarder l'homme deux fois,
Pour prononcer sur lui son jugement.

[18] Ver. 24. **Cannot trace.** Lit., *no searching (perscrutatio)*, לֹא חֵקֶר, adverbial negative phrase, *inscrutably.* The *fact* is seen, as in the midnight popular commotion, but the real hand that does it is invisible. Comp. Amos iii. 6, "Shall there be evil in a city and the Lord hath not done it?"

[19] Ver. 25. **In the night.** The same imagery as in ver. 20, suddenness and darkness; the hand unseen.

[20] Ver 26. **As they stand** Lit.: *Beneath the wicked He smites them*, or if we take סָפָק as a noun—*beneath the wicked their blow.* This expression תַּחַת רְשָׁעִים, has been very variously rendered. תחת has been taken to mean, "*as though* they were wicked," or *as* wicked, or *in place* of wicked, or *after the* manner (DELITZSCH), nach Missethäter Art, or mit den Ruchlosen (SCHLOTTMANN); or רשעים is made the plural of רֶשַׁע, *on account* of, or as the *price of* their transgressions. These are all secondary senses of תחת coming from its primary sense of *under*, very much as ὑπο is used in Greek. But may not the difficulty here have arisen, as in other places, from overlooking the simple idea that comes from the exact literality? It is a second example, as e sought to be expressed by the word in brackets. The first was an unseen blow; this is an open one. *Beneath the wicked smites he them*—right where they stand—the very ground beneath their feet. Or תחת may mean their support, that which is *under them*—thus meaning their very limbs. This latter idea is strengthened by a comparison of Habakkuk iii. 16, וְתַחְתַּי אֶרְגָּז, *I trembled beneath me*, in my *underneathing*, my limbs or supports. Just so Homer uses ὑπό; in Iliad VII. 6 ὑπὸ γυῖα λέλυνται—*his limbs relaxed beneath*—not beneath his limbs; ὑπὸ used adverbially. Thus regarded as two varying examples, לילה in verse 25, and the words במקום ראים in the 26th, are in direct contrast. Such a sudden and open blow at the very foundations, suggests the מַהְפֵּכָה or upturning of Sodom and Gomorrah, which is RASCHI's idea.

[21] Ver. 28. **Before his face.** The pronoun in עליו may perhaps refer to the sinner. In that case it should be rendered *to bring upon him, the cry*, the μήνιμα, vengeance or retribution, of the poor. See Homer, Iliad XXII. 358; Odyss. XI. 73: μή τοί τι θεῶν μήνιμα γένωμαι.

[22] Ver. 29. **Disturb.** Primary sense of רשע, whence that of wickedness. It is in evident contrast here with ישקיט.

Or who can trace Him, when He hides his face,
Whether towards a nation or a man?
30 Whether against[23] the ruling of the vile,
Or those who of the people make[24] a prey?

31 For O had he but said[25] to God:
"I bear it.—I will not offend;
32 Beyond what I behold, O teach thou me;
Have I done evil, I will do no more."
33 On thine own terms,[26] shall He requite [and say],
"As thou dost spurn or choose [so be it], not as[27] I?"
34 Let men of understanding say,—
Or any strong and wise[28] who hears me now.
35 Job speaks in ignorance,
And without understanding are his words.
36 O would that Job were proved to the extreme,
For his replies like those of evil men.
37 For sure he adds rebellion to his sin;
Among us in defiance claps his hands,
And still at God doth multiply his words.

[23] Ver. 30. **Against.** Negative sense of מִן.

[24] Ver. 30. **Make a prey.** Lit., *from snares of the people.*

[25] Ver. 31. **For, had he said.** An elliptical expression of a wish, or of what Job ought to have done: *Ah, had he said.* The adversative sense of the כִּי denotes that he should have so said. It is, however, very difficult to preserve both in English, namely the *chiding* and the *reason* in the כִּי, and, at the same time, the regret and surprise expressed in the particle הֲ which is exclamatory as well as interrogative. הֶאָמַר is not the infinitive Niphal, as some take it, but the Kal preterite and the exclamatory interrogative with Segol before a guttural with Quamets.

[26] Ver. 33. **On thine own terms.** Lit., *that which is from thee.*

[27] Ver. 33. **Not as I.** This can only refer to God, not to Elihu; but it makes a sudden change of person, which, though allowable in Hebrew, is too abrupt for a close English translation, without a preparation such as is supplied by the bracketed words, *and say*, in the first clause, or something equivalent.

[28] Ver. 34. **Or any strong and wise.** Lit., *strong, wise man.* גֶּבֶר is not used superfluously here, or tautologically. אַנְשֵׁי לֵבָב may be taken as referring to those present who claimed the reputation of wisdom from age, position, or otherwise, such as the friends who had been contending with Job. Elihu appeals to such, or to any other one in the audience who might be a man of note, or strength, (גבר), though not professedly a חָכָם or Sage. He appeals to all men of character and intelligence.

Chapter XXXV.

1 And Elihu[1] answered and said:

2 Dost thou hold this for right?
Thou said'st, I am more just than God.
3 Yes—thou[2] *dost* say it: "what the gain to thee?"
What profit have I, more than from my sin?"

4 I answer thee;
And thy companions[3] who take part with thee:
5 Look to the heavens and see;
Behold the skies so high above thy head.

[1] Ver. 1. **And Elihu answered.** This chapter follows on so closely and directly in the spirit of the preceding, and especially of its concluding verses, that it may well raise a question as to the genuineness, or antiquity, of this intervening statement.

[2] Ver. 3. **Yes—thou dost say it.** כִּי is here the particle of proof, as though Job had intimated some dissent by look or gesture. Such is the fair import of thy words; it cannot be denied.

[3] Ver. 4. **Thy companions.** This cannot mean the three friends. As unlikely is the opinion of Delitzsch that

6 If thou hast sinned, what doest[4] thou to Him?
If many are thy sins, what doest thou to Him?
7 If thou art just, what givest thou to Him?
What profit from thy hand does He receive?
8 To one just like thyself pertains thy wrong;
Unto the son of man[5] thy righteousness.

9 "From hosts of men oppressed[6] the cries resound;"
[So sayest thou[7]]; "they groan beneath the tyrant's arm."
10 But no one saith,[8] "where is my maker God;
Who in the night[9] time giveth songs[10] of praise?
11 Who teacheth us beyond[11] the beasts of earth,
And makes us wiser than the birds of heaven."
12 Thus[12] is it that He hears not when they cry
By reason of the pride of evil men.
13 For God will not hear vanity;
Nor will the Almighty hold it in regard.
14 Yes, even[13] when thou sayest, thou seest Him not,
There is judgment still before Him—therefore wait.
15 But now, because His anger visits[14] not,

Elihu means the אַנְשֵׁי אָוֶן of xxxiv. 36, and the פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן of xxxiv. 8, with whom Job is represented as joining himself. It is more probably a general challenge to all who might take his side in justifying such complaints.

[4] Ver. 6. **What dost thou to him?** The expressions in the two Hebrew clauses are so alike that it would seem idle to seek diversity of translation. There is moreover a real impressiveness in the repetition: In either case, whether it be a single sin, as might seem implied in the preterite or aorist, אִם חָטָאתָ, or many transgressions, or a life of transgression, *what dost thou to Him?* Such a contrast seems intended. The variance in the verbs, תפעל בו—תעשה לו, would seem to be rather for the sake of parallelistic rhythm than as intending any difference in the appeal. DELITZSCH: Wirk'st du auf ihn—thu'st du ihm.

[5] Ver. 8. **Son of man.** It is in vain here to seek nice distinctions between איש and אדם.

[6] Ver. 9. **Oppressed.** עֲשׁוּקִים here cannot be rendered *oppressions*. Amos iii. 9 gives it no countenance, and Ecclesiastes iv. 1 is against it, since, in the same verse, the word is used in its only proper sense of *oppressed men*. The noun however may be regarded as implied. The subject of the verb may in like manner be included. They do not cry out singly and apart, but from a great multitude of the oppressed. *They cry out—men everywhere cry out*, but not to God.

[7] Ver. 9. **(So sayest thou).** The words in brackets simply express what is certainly intended by Elihu, namely to cite one of Job's speeches for comment, whether rightly understood or not. This reference is to what Job says generally, ch. xxiv., and especially in ver. 12, where almost the very words occur.

[8] Ver. 10. **But no one saith.** It gives the reason why God does not hear: The oppressed no more acknowledge Him than do the oppressors. A godless humanitarianism cannot expect his favor. Both parties being alike deficient here, He lets things work their own cure in such ways as are so graphically described, xxxiv. 20. It is, however, the strongest mode of saying that He does hear those who fly to Him for relief and consolation in the night of suffering. Elihu was a sound political philosopher, as well as a devout theologian.

[9] Ver. 10. **The night time.** Metaphorically, the time of sorrow and oppression.

[10] Ver. 10. **Songs of praise.** Such is the special meaning of זְמִרוֹת. "*Songs in the night.*" Comp. Ps. xlii. 8; lxxvii. 6; cxix. 15; cxxxiv. 1; xvi. 7; Cant. iii. 1. For a specimen of rich and glorious practical exposition read the old Puritan CARYL on these Songs in the Night.

[11] Ver. 11. **Beyond:** *more than.* Some render מ *from*, instead of taking it as comparative: *from* the beasts, *etc.* On the metaphorical wisdom of the birds, see notes to xxviii. 7 and 21.

[12] Ver. 12. **Thus is it.** שָׁם (*there*) may denote condition as well as place and time: *in such a case*, or *in such circumstances*, or relations; as Ps. cxxxiii. 3: כִּי שָׁם *for there* (in such a state of things, that is, in the exercise of brotherly love) *the Lord commanded the blessing.* The reference is not to the mountain there mentioned. See also Hos. vi. 7. The Hebrew order of the first clause of this verse is somewhat unusual. If strictly followed it would require this rendering:

> Thus is it that they cry—and He hears not—
> By reason of the pride of evil men.

But in that way the English reader might miss the sense; since מִפְּנֵי, in the second clause, must clearly be connected with יִצְעָקוּ *they cry.* To connect it with לֹא יַעֲנֶה as the ground of God's not hearing, would be meaningless and absurd.

[13] Ver. 14. **Yes, even when thou sayest.** אַף כִּי is often rendered *much less, quanto minus*, but here the sense is better reached by the rendering adopted. See DELITZSCH, who renders it *although.* Notwithstanding what Elihu says about God's not visiting, or strictly marking human wrong, he does not mean to teach the Divine indifference either to man's evil, or to his suffering. דִּין לְפָנָיו; *the* cause is still before Him; judgment is with Him; in its own way and time it will appear. The reference is to what Job says, xxiii. 8.

[14] Ver. 15. **Visits not.** אַיִן has strictly a verbal sense, and is not a mere qualifying negative particle like לֹא. It simply denotes, *it is not so*, being the negation of the other verbal יֵשׁ, *it is.* Here, however, it is a more emphatic way of expressing the negation of פָּקַד: *It is not the case that His anger visits*, expressing the general truth rather than a particular fact, or a particular denial. Its being followed by לֹא shows that אַיִן is not taken here by itself, for the protasis to which פָּקַד אַפּוֹ is the apodosis, as E. V. regards it: "because it is not so, therefore hath He visited in His anger." Such a view breaks up the whole argument of Elihu; as is also done by those who refer this, ver. 15, to God's visitation of Job. SCHLOTTMANN leaves it indefinite, and DELITZSCH regards it as doubtful. RENAN refers it to God's wider dealings:

Nor strictly[15] marks wide-spread[16] iniquity,
16 Job fills his mouth with vanity,
And without knowledge multiplieth words.

Mais, parce que sa colére ne s'exerce pas encore,
Parce qu'il fait semblant d'ignorer *nos* fautes.

Elihu is plain with Job, but at the same time tender, and cannot mean that God had not visited him as he deserved.

[15] Ver. 15. **Strictly marks.** מְאֹד qualifies יָדַע *to know* (here in the sense of *notice*, similar to פקד *visit*), to know *particularly*. It cannot qualify פַּשׁ. Compare Ps. cxxx. 11: *If thou Lord should'st be strict to mark iniquities.*

[16] Ver. 15. **Wide-spread iniquity.** The Hebrew פּוּשׁ and its derivatives with the predominant sense of exuberance, extravagance, multiplication, taken in *malam partem* (licentiousness), gives the sense required here without going to the Arabic. See how it is used, Hab. i. 8; Mal. iii. 20; Jer. l. 11; Nah. iii. 18 (פָּשָׂה, Lev. xiii. 17, and a number of other places, of the spreading leprosy). So the Targum and Jewish commentators generally. The LXX. and VULGATE give it the sense of פשע, and there is good reason for regarding them as cognate words. פשע *transgression* is *passing over*, going beyond bounds—*license, licentiousness.* The idea is: God is not always exhibiting His special vengeance in the *multiplicity* of human sins. "He is not strict to mark iniquity;" or He would be always striking. Besides His long-suffering, so often spoken of in the Old Testament, there is the great דִּין, or judgment, ver. 14, always before Him. No cause is really forgotten. But Job complains of Him because He lets "the wicked live;" see xxi. 7. There is a greatness in Elihu's views unsurpassed by anything in the book outside of the Divine address, and that is a sufficient answer to those who would argue the spuriousness of this portion, because there is no mention of his being answered with the rest.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

1 Then Elihu continued and said:

2 A moment wait[1] that I may show thee still,
That there are words for[2] God.
3 Unto the Far[3] will I lift up my thought;
'Tis to my Maker[4] I ascribe the right.
4 Indeed, there is no dissembling in my word;
It is the all-knowing One[5] that deals with thee.

[1] Ver. 2. **Wait.** Some appearance perhaps of impatience on the part of Job leading to a slight interruption, and then a resumption, as indicated by the scholium of continuance at the head of the chapter. כתר, זעיר, and חוה have been pronounced Aramaisms, but they are all pure Hebrew as well as Syriac.

[2] Ver. 2. **For God.** In justification of the Divine proceedings. There is nothing arrogant in this declaration of Elihu as some maintain.

[3] Ver. 3. **Unto the far.** The double preposition מ and ל, gives a twofold sense, *to* and *from*, including here both ideas, elevating the thought *to* God (the Afar) and deriving thought *from* Him. The words easily bear this, since אֶשָּׂא may have the two senses of *taking*, or *raising*, according to the context and the preposition used. A very little change here gives that appearance of boasting and vanity which UMBREIT and some others are so fond of ascribing to Elihu. It is, however, perfectly consistent with the unfeigned modesty of his opening. The word דֵּעַ or דֵּעָה (דעת) is not necessarily knowledge as *science*, exact or inexact, but often means *opinion, view*, sincere conviction. It may be *cognitio, notitia*, rather than *scientia* or ἐπιστήμη. This is the way in which the Rabbinical writers everywhere use דעת. Elihu says that the view he takes shall not be a narrow, or personal, or party one. He will aim to bring all his reasonings from that far-reaching, yet most near and plain truth, the unchangeable righteousness of God. This gives him confidence, and when this is understood all appearance of conceit disappears.

[4] Ver. 3. **To my Maker I ascribe the right.** In ascribing to God the right, he can, without arrogance, speak in his name, and all the more confidently whilst using such tenderness towards Job. This helps to explain what follows.

[5] Ver. 4. **It is the all-knowing one that deals with thee.** A comparison of this with what the same speaker says in the very same words, xxxvii. 16, puts it beyond doubt that God is meant. Even if regarded as a claim to inspiration, it would not be inconsistent with a true humility. If Elihu felt that he was speaking to Job the very truth of God, however learned, it would be false modesty in him to disclaim it. Therefore does he so affirm his sincerity in the next verse: לא שקר, there is truth in what I say: Through it, "the Perfect in knowledge *speaks with* thee;" if we may so render עִמָּךְ. This is quite different from the impression that RENAN's version would give, applying the words to Elihu himself. C'est une homme d'une science accomplie qui te parle. SCHLOTTMANN and ROSENMUELLER regard it as spoken by Elihu of himself, yet without boasting, and as only claiming what was due to the strength and depth of his convictions. They thus take תמים in its more primitive sense of *integer, purus, etc.*, rather than as denoting perfection in the degree or height of knowledge. The old commentator MERCERUS gives this admirably: De se dicit Elihu quod Job habeat hominem secum agentem *integrum sententiis*, et *pure, sincere*, ac ut par est, sentientem, qui nihil sit adulteraturus, aut depravaturus in alienum sensum. The passage has been marred by the rendering *is before thee*, which cannot be obtained from עִמָּךְ. It gives a wrong impression as to the one of whom it is said, and of the spirit with which the declaration is made. Regarded as denoting speech (*speaks with thee*) it would be an inward rather than an outward communing; but as we have seen in several places, עִמָּךְ standing alone (or without any verb) denotes rather *dealing with*, and in either view would favor the idea of God being the subject intended rather than Elihu himself. It may be said, however, to come to nearly the same thing whether Elihu intends to represent God by the words תמים דעות, or himself as speaking to Job in His name. In either case it is Divine knowledge he professes to give, or "knowledge brought from afar" (ver. 3).

5 Lo—God is great,[6] but nought does He[7] despise;
Great in the power of His intelligence.
6 He will not "let the wicked[8] live;"
And justice will He render to the poor.
7 His eye He takes not[9] from the righteous man;
With kings upon the throne,
He makes them sit in glory;[10] they are raised on high.
8 Again, when bound in iron chains,[11]
And held in sorrow's bands,
9 Then showeth He to them what they have done,
Their oversteppings,[12] how they've walked in pride.
10 Thus openeth He their ear to discipline,
And warns them that from evil they turn[13] back.
11 If they will listen and obey,
Then shall they spend their days in good,
Their years in joyfulness.
12 If they hear not, they perish by the sword,
And without knowledge[14] shall they yield their breath.

13 But those impure[15] in heart, they treasure wrath;
Such cry not[16] when He bindeth them.
14 Their very soul dies[17] in them in their youth;
Their life, it is a living with the[18] vile.
15 Yet in his suffering[19] saveth He the poor;
In straitening openeth He their ear.

[6] Ver. 5. **Great.** כַּבִּיר *kabbir.* It reminds us of the frequent Arabian doxology from the same root: *Allah Akbar.*

[7] Ver. 5. **Despise,** יִמְאָס, *reject*, overlook. Elihu presents the sublime contrast, or that general equilibrium in the Divine attributes which our science so much ignores: God's attention to the most minute as well as to the largest things of His creation. "He numbereth the very hairs of our heads." This is "the *power* of His intelligence," (כח לב), *force de son intelligence*, as RENAN renders it. It is a higher thing than His dynamical *force.*

[8] Ver. 6. **Let the wicked live.** This is the literal rendering of יְחַיֶּה; that is, live on in their wickedness. It is not inconsistent with what Elihu says, xxxv. 9, 10, 15, about God's forbearance. This rendering is chosen because it would seem as though the word יְחַיֶּה had been used with direct reference to Job's complaint, xxi. 7: "Wherefore do the wicked live, grow old, *etc.?*

[9] Ver. 7. **Takes not from.** Lit., *does not diminish; constant, steady* vision, never *relaxing.* What follows about the righteous man, and his vicissitudes, has, undoubtedly, reference to Job, but not in the narrow way taken by the friends. Elihu does not charge him with gross outward crimes, such as "wronging the widow," and "breaking the orphan's arms" (xxii. 9), but he sees the possibility that even one who has borne the character of *the just* (ὁ δίκαιος, ὁ καλοκἀγαθός) if placed in high station, "sitting with kings," and greatly tempted to pride, may become self-confident, and so fall as to need the chastisements of God, "whose eye is never withdrawn from him." This "sitting on the throne with kings," as an honored and consulted assessor or vizier, may have been suggested by what Job says himself very eloquently, but somewhat proudly (xxix. 9), of the honors paid to him by people and princes.

[10] Ver. 7. **Sit in glory.** לנצח is improperly rendered *forever*, like לעולם. It is not a word of time but of degree, completeness,—a general superlative of excellence, or superiority.

[11] Ver. 8. **Bound in iron chains;** either from the capricious tyranny of their royal or popular patrons, or from their own too strongly tempted pride. It is a supposed case, but one readily presenting itself to the speaker's mind from what Job says, xxix. 9, of the favor he had once enjoyed with the people and the great.

[12] Ver. 9. **Their oversteppings:** The most literal etymological sense of פִּשְׁעֵיהֶם. RENAN:

Par leur péchés, par leur orgueil.

[13] Ver. 10. **From evil they turn back.** The word ישובון implies barely a beginning in the evil way. Whatever suspicion of Job Elihu here may intimate, it is very different from the gross and wholly unwarranted criminations of the three older friends, besides being stated as a mere hypothesis. But the striking distinction is the freedom from all exasperation, such as they show, especially Zophar and Bildad (see viii. 2; xi. 2, 3; xx. 2). Elihu represents God's dealings thus far as all proceeding from love, from that merciful "eye upon the righteous man," which is never withdrawn, though sometimes leaving him to himself for a season, that he may be tried and gain self-knowledge. It reminds one of a touching passage in the Koranic Commentary of Al-Zamakhshari on Surat xviii. 75: Mohammed had committed a fault for which he had been severely visited. Says the commentator: "We have it from the Prophet, Allah bless him, that when this was revealed (Sur. xviii. 75) he prayed, O Allah! never again leave me to myself for the wink of an eye." Al. Zam., p. 780.

[14] Ver. 12. **Without knowledge.** Comp. iv. 21.

[15] Ver. 13. **But those impure in heart.** The חנפי לב in distinction from the צדיק, or reputed righteous man tempted and disciplined, as described above.

[16] Ver. 13. **Such cry not.** Another difference: They are not led to prayer and repentance. See xxxv. 10.

[17] Ver. 14. **Their very soul.** Soul is here in contrast with *life* in the 2d clause. Passages like it in the Proverbs would support the idea of spiritual death. *Their life:* their course of life.

[18] Ver. 14. **The vile.** קְדֵשִׁים, the *unclean, the obscene* rather. Lit., those devoted to the obscene worship of Astarte, and other heathenisms. See the word Deut. xxiii. 18; 1 Kings xiv. 24; xv. 12; xxii. 47. Comp. also Gen. xxxviii. 21, 22.

[19] Ver. 15. **In his suffering.** SCHLOTTMANN ren-

16 Thus thee, too, would He draw[20] from trouble's mouth,
To a broad place,[21] no straitening underneath,
With richest food[22] the spreading[23] of thy board.
17 But hast thou[24] filled the judgment of the bad;
Judgment and Justice will lay hold on thee.
18 For there is wrath;[25] see lest it stir thee up against the blow;[26]
Then a great ransom may not turn thy[27] scale.
19 Thy wealth[28] its price! no treasure here avails

ders: *in His compassion*, referring the pronoun to God. This is a sense which עָנִי will bear, but it would not harmonize here with לַחַץ in the 2d clause.

[20] Ver. 16. **Would He draw.** הֵסִית means literally *to incite*—either *to* or *from*—by *sharp* or by *gentle* means. The former is the more common, but the latter is to be taken here. SCHLOTTMANN: loct er aus—*allures*, *entices*. The general word, *draws*, *attracts*, seems better.

[21] Ver. 16. **Broad place:** The favorite Hebrew figure for *prosperity*, as *straitness*, or *narrowness* for the reverse.

[22] Ver. 16. **With richest food.** This is what is meant by the Hebrew מְלֵא דֶשֶׁן *full of fat*, a figure not poetical in modern languages.

[23] Ver. 16. **Spreading of thy board.** More literally, *setting*—that which is set down to rest upon it. נַחַת from נוּחַ *to rest*. Hiph. *demisit, deposuit.*

[24] Ver. 17. **But hast thou filled:** if thou hast filled. So SCHLOTTMANN takes it, conditionally. Elihu does not regard Job as one of these *impure of heart*, or "hypocrites in heart," as E. V., renders it, or the חַנְפֵי לֵב of ver. 13. He however makes the supposition of what would have been had Job gone to that extent, and makes it the ground of warning in ver. 18. The word דִּין here, just like our word *judgment*, may denote Job's judgment in the case, as some take it, or God's verdict or sentence upon the wicked. In this latter view, which is preferred here, it may be transferred to the wickedness that causes judgment. Hast thou filled up the wickedness of the wicked (the measure of his judgment) then expect no mercy. "Judgment and justice," instead of threatening, "will take hold on thee," יִתְמֹכוּ, which DELITZSCH strangely renders, "will take hold on one another." He seems to have regarded it as an abbreviated Hithpahel: יִתְמֹכוּ for יִתְתַּמְּכוּ. The pronoun is not needed, it is so easily supplied. It can hardly be that דִּין is used of Job's judgment in the one clause, and of God's judgment in the other

[25] Ver. 18. **For there is wrath.** By comparing כִּי חֵמָה with the same words, used in a very similar manner, xix. 29, it will be seen that this is a warning formula. Cautionary words accompany it in both cases; there immediately preceding, here immediately following. פֶּן is an elliptical particle of warning, or of calling attention, like the Latin *ne*, or the Greek μή with ὅρα (*see to it*), or δείδω, or some similar word understood; comp. PLAT. *Phædon*, 69 A., Ὦ μακάριε Σιμμία, μὴ οὐχ αὕτη ᾖ ἡ ὀρθὴ κ. τ. λ.; Iliad I. 26, μή σε παρὰ νηυσὶ κιχείω, Odyss. V. 467 (δείδω understood; compare line 300) and other places. הֲסִיתְךָ with its usual sense of *inciting to* or *from* (here *to* or *against*, because followed by בְּ) must have an indefinite or impersonal subject. DELITZSCH and SCHLOTTMANN render it *allure*, as in ver. 16, but this would require חֵמָה for the subject which would be harsh (*wrath alluring*) even if the grammar would allow. It would, however, be giving a feminine subject to a masculine verb *following*, which is hardly defensible from the case Prov. xii. 25. חֵמָה may, perhaps, be regarded as implying the subject of הֵסִית, by reason of its representing the whole case. If the impersonal view does not satisfy, the subject may be regarded as impliedly in שֶׂפֶק, or that to which the warning refers: "Let it not stir thee up (the blow) against it (the blow itself). This would make the בְּ in שֶׂפֶק very easy, and perfectly grammatical.

[26] Ver. 18. **The blow.** The places to guide us in determining the meaning of שֶׂפֶק = סֶפֶק, are ch. xxxiv. 26, 37. The idea of *sudden striking* is in both. In the second, however, *hand* is understood (*clap the hand*), or some other part of the body, as in Numb. xxiv. 20; Lam. ii. 15; Job xxvii. 33, and that gives it the secondary sense of *scorning* or defiance. *Blow*, however, is the primary literal sense (evidently onomatopical, S. P. K.) and that seems here most fitting, besides being better adapted to יְסִית־בְּ,—against the *blow*, or the *chastisement* as CONANT renders it. SCHLOTTMANN would give it the sense of mockery (*zum Spott*), DELITZSCH of *scorning* (*zum Höhnen*, with reference to xxxiv. 37. These, however, would require that יְסִית be followed by לְ instead of בְּ, as DILLMANN remarks (see concordance of places). DELITZSCH regards חֵמָה as denoting the anger of Job, but the comparison with xix. 29, where it is used in precisely the same way, shows that God's wrath is meant, and that כִּי חֵמָה is to be taken independently. The drift of Elihu's language is that Job has got to that point where he needs a caution, such as he himself gave to his monitors, xix. 29. Beware of further defiance. He has reason to pray: "Keep back thy servant from presumptuous sins" (מִזֵּדִים, Ps. xix. 14), from the defiant, unforgivable sin, מִפֶּשַׁע רָב, "from the great transgression."

[27] Ver. 18. **Turn thy scale.** The word ransom here (כֹּפֶר) is suggested to Elihu by his own language respecting the penitent sufferer, xxxiii. 24: "I have found a ransom." The word נָטָה, Hiph. הִטָּה, to incline (transitively) or to *deflect*, is repeatedly used, elliptically and figuratively, in the sense of deflecting the scale in judgment. See Prov. xviii. 5; Isai. x. 2; xxix. 21; Amos v. 12. The last case is most like this since we find them in close connection with this same word כֹּפֶר. The verb thus used, might just as well, as far as grammar is concerned, have for its object the person favored, although the cases cited relate to the unjustly condemned. The context alone must determine whether it is a turning the scale *in favor of* or *against*; and, in fact, the one implies the other. DELITZSCH gives יַטְּךָ the sense *verleiten*, *mislead*, *seduce*, and makes the *ransom* refer to the hope of restoration. It must, however, have the same application here as in xxxiii. 24. It is something which God provides, not the sufferer. Job had been stripped of all, so that, as DELITZSCH says, "any reference to his own riches," as something that he could offer, "is out of the question." In regard to the negative אַל, it is used in the same way as the Greek μή for οὐ where the declaration is a subjective one. It is not simply a denial of the happening of the event, but of its possibility, and so the particle is really dependent: *It cannot be that, etc.* There is, moreover, to be taken into the account the influence of פֶּן above in making the clause subjective: as though repeated: *take care lest a great ransom should not turn the scale in thy favor.* The version of E. V. would demand יַסִּירְךָ in the clause above.

[28] Ver. 19. **Thy wealth its price!** The word שׁוּעַ here used, may mean either *wealth* or a *cry*, as clearly appears by the respective contexts in which they are found. For the first see xxxiv. 19 (שׁוֹעַ), Isai. xxxii. 18, and this place, where it seems determined by its connection with בְּצָר, for which see Job xxii. 24, 26. The other usage is more frequent. The connection between the two meanings is not easily traced. שׁוּעַ, *to cry, implore*, and its noun derivatives, seem like onomatopes: *shuagh—sugh—sigh*. Comp. the Syriac סוּק used for the crying, bleating of the flocks, Jud. v. 16. As Job was utterly destitute, the reference must have been to his former vast possessions. All his camels and oxen, *etc.*, could not avail as the price of this ransom. It is its spiritual value vainly estimated by the richest outward things. עֵרֶךְ, with the price for its subject, is used here precisely as in xxviii. 17, in the attempted prizing of Wis-

Nor all the powers[29] of might.

20 O long not for the[30] night,—
The going up of nations in their place.
21 Take heed—turn not thy face[31] to sin,
For this thou choosest[32] more than suffering.

22 Lo God exalteth by His power.
Who is a teacher like to Him?
23 Who is it that assigns[33] to Him His way?
Or who can say to Him, Thou doest wrong?
24 Remember that thou magnify His work,
Which men so celebrate.
25 With wonder gaze they[34] on it, Adam's race,
And every man[35] beholds it from afar.

26 Lo God is great,[36] we know Him not;
Unsearchable the number of His years.
27 For He it is who draws[37] the water drops;
Whence they distil to rain in place of[38] mist;

dom: "Gold and crystals cannot prize it, give its estimate," לא יערכנה. The price of redemption is far above rubies.

[29] Ver. 19. **Powers of might.** *Literally, the mighty of strength.* כח does not mean *opes* here, or *wealth*, but has its literal sense—*no wealth—no strength.*

[30] Ver. 20. **The night.** הַלָּיְלָה, with the article, is the night of death emphatically, as our Saviour styles it, John ix. 4, "the night wherein no man can work;" see Ecclesiastes ix. 5. Elihu alludes to Job's having prayed for death, as appears in several places. The whole passage furnishes another of those cases where the closest adherence to the most literal rendering gives the best guide to the idea. The verb עלה, to *go up*, becomes used of dying (*departing, going off*) from the old idea of the spirit, or breath, *going up* to God, its source, and the body *going down* to dust. There is no reference here to the underworld, and the difficulty arises from a feeling of incongruity connected with the figure of *going up*, especially where the language is used of evil men. But there is in it no idea of going to Heaven according to the modern notion. It is simply a mysterious *going off.* Another seeming incongruity is made by תחת, the opposite to עלה, apparently. This is especially felt in the translation of Conant, which otherwise would seem to have much in its favor:

> Long not for that night,
> When the nations are gathered to the world below.

Even where a word like עלה has lost its figure, as employed in some special applications, poetical feeling would be against its use in connection with a real opposite. But תחתם here means simply *in their place*, right where they stand, their very foundation, as in the examples cited, note to xxxiv. 26. The proof passages for this sense of עלה (*dying*, as *going up*, or *off*) are Ecclesiastes xxi. 7, where we have the idea without the word, and Job v. 26, and Ps. cii. 25, where the very word occurs just as it does here: the Hiphil in Ps. cii. 16, making no difference. In the first passage (Job v. 26) the incongruity alluded to is not felt as jarring with our modern conception, because it is said of a supposed good man, and it is in beautiful harmony with the figure of the sheaf going up to the garner, which overcomes the other image, in the same passage of going down to the grave. In Ps. cii. 25, אַל תַּעֲלֵנִי (*take me not up* (*not off*) *in the midst of my days*), the *going up* (or *being taken up*) means no more than the עלות in this place, though said here of many *going up*, or *going off*, in the night of death. The plural עמים, *peoples* or *nations*, is used here to make it the more impressive, and to give Job the idea of its being a general or common doom which he should not desire to anticipate. They are *going off* fast enough, this vast procession of the dead, disappearing in that night to which all human existence seems to lead. עמים the multitudes. It calls to mind Homer's κλυτὰ ἔθνεα νεκρῶν, *the far-famed nations of the dead* (Odyss. X. 526, and other places); more numerous than the nations of the living. In the word לעלות, the ל of the infinitive may be taken as specificative: to wit, *the going up, etc.*; and so the second clause may be regarded as epexegetical of the first, or as in apposition with לילה: the night, I mean, in which the nations go up, *etc.* Delitzsch renders it: "Long not for the night to come which shall remove people from their place," and seems to refer it to some great and special judgments, not to the general night of death. He has no authority for rendering תחתם *from their place.* Schlottmann more correctly, *an ihrer Stätte, in* or *on* their place, *right where they stand*, or just as they are. Comp. Ecclesiastes xl. 3.

[31] Ver. 21. **Turn not,** אַל תֵּפֶן. *Look not;* do not even set your face in that direction, give no *countenance* (פנים, פנה) to iniquity.

[32] Ver. 21. **Thou choosest.** That is, thou art choosing to turn in the wrong direction—*towards* sin, and away from God. It is a *tendency* charged upon him, but not actual sin. Elihu is very plain with Job, but at the same time judicious and tender. He desires his justification, xxxiii. 32.

[33] Ver. 23. **Who is it that assigns?** Comp. Isai. xl. 13, 14.

[34] Ver. 25. **With wonder gaze.** Among the Hebrew verbs of sight, חזה may be regarded as more emotional, and more spiritual than ראה. It denotes sight with feeling, or an interest of wonder in the object, like the Greek θεάομαι, or the Latin *specto*, in distinction from ὁράω the merely visual, or θεωρέω which is more perceptive, that is, of facts and truths rather than of objects.

[35] Ver. 25. **Every man—from afar.** The most common man, אנוש, cannot help seeing it in its remotest aspects. Comp. Ps. xix. 1, and Rom. i. 20.

[36] Ver. 26. **Lo God is great.** This declaration seems more frequent in Job than in any other book in the Bible, and strongly calls to mind the similar Arabian and Mohammedan doxologies.

[37] Ver. 27. **Who draweth up.** *Drawing* is the more usual sense of the verb גרע, that of *diminishing*, seeming to come from its sense *detraxit*, but the rendering of E. V., *maketh small*, suits very well some parts of the process intended to be described. If we render it *draweth*, then the water drops must denote the substance drawn up, whatever it may be, and which becomes water drops afterwards.

[38] Ver. 27. **In place of mist.** Gen. ii. 6 puts beyond

28 Even that with which the heavens[39] flow down,
And drop on man abundantly.

29 Is there[40] who understands the floatings[41] of the cloud,
The thunderings[42] of His canopy?
30 Behold, upon it[43] spreadeth He the light,
Whilst darkening[44] the sea's profoundest depths.
31 (Yet, 'tis by these that He the nations rules,
And giveth food in rich supply).
32 O'er either[45] hand the lightning doth He[46] wrap,

doubt the meaning of אֵד as *vapor* or *mist*, in distinction from rain itself which comes from it. But the ל has given trouble. "According to the vapor thereof," E. V.; "with its mist," DELITZSCH; zu Regen läutert sich's im Nebel, SCHLOTTMANN; wenn er in Nebel sich gehüllt, UMBREIT; Qui se fondent en pluie et forment ses vapeurs, RENAN. But the vapor is the preceding state. *Vice, in loco, in place of*, is a meaning of ל, of which NOLDIUS in his Concordance of particles gives a good number of examples. The one nearest to this is Gen. xi. 3, *bitumen for mortar*, הַחֵמָר לַחֹמֶר, or הַלְּבֵנָה לְאָבֶן, *brick* for *stone*. Bitumen *for mortar*, or *in place* of mortar; the imperfect substance *for*, that is, as a *preparation for* the more finished; or mortar *in place of* bitumen, according to the reverse conception. Grammatically, the preposition ל would denote either of these according to the context. Here it would demand the latter—*rain* now in place of what was *mist* before the distillation. The pronoun in לְאֵדוֹ shows this—*its* mist—the rain's mist, or that *from* which the rain is formed. The subject of יָזֹקּוּ, taken intransitively, is water drops. *They distill into rain*, that is, the water or vapor that was raised up called by the name of what it becomes. The primary sense of זקק is *binding* (whence זקים *chains*, ver. 8), *compression*, hence *straining* or *condensation*. They *condense* into rain, would be a good rendering if it would not seem to make Elihu talk too scientifically; and yet some such idea must have been in his mind. מָטָר may be taken, grammatically, as either the direct or the remote object of the intransitive verb: They distill, or condense, rain, or they distill into rain. There is really no great difficulty in the clause unless made, as is often done, by overlooking the directness and simplicity of the language. The general fact of the transformation is known to all, but our best science yet finds a mystery in attempting to trace the exact rationale of the process. "The law of the rain" (חֹק לַמָּטָר, xxviii. 26) is yet, in some points, one of the secrets of the Divine חָכְמָה, as it was in the days of Job.

[39] Ver. 28. **The heavens.** שְׁחָקִים is the poetical word for the skies, the high, attenuated expanse, from שָׁחַק *attrivit, comminuit, made smooth* or *thin*, as רקיע from רקע, *to beat out* like gold leaf, *to spread out*. See xxxvii. 18, and Ps. lxxxix. 7.

[40] Ver. 29. **Is there?** This may be treated as a section by itself. After the general account of the rain comes a special description of the thunder-storm.

[41] Ver. 29. **The floatings,** מִפְרְשֵׂי עָב. Comp. מִפְלְשֵׂי עָב xxxviii. 16, *suspensions* of the cloud. It is, in both cases, the mystery of the cloud hanging in the air, seemingly without support. We talk of gravity and think we have explained it. GESENIUS gives to מפרש here the sense of expansion merely, as in Ezek. xxvii. It would then refer to it as stationary, or in a tranquil state, reminding us of Graham's description:

Calmness sits throned on yon unmoving cloud.

This sets the two phenomena in contrast and gives more force to the allusion to the gathering storm in the 2d clause.

[42] Ver. 29. **Thunderings of His canopy.** תְּשֻׁאוֹת; see xxxix. 7; Isai. xxii. 2. God is said to dwell in the nimbus, or thunder-cloud, as in a tent, or canopy. The word סֻכָּה strictly means a temporary booth, as a *retreat* or hiding-place. Comp. Ps. lxxxi. 8, בְּסֵתֶר רַעַם, *in the secret place of the thunder*, and especially Ps. xviii. 12, where we have this same figure of the booth or canopy: חֶשְׁכַת מַיִם עָבֵי שְׁחָקִים.

[43] Ver. 30. **Upon it;** עָלָיו, upon the cloud, (עַל עָב), the nimbus. The pronoun is by many referred to God: He spreadeth the light upon himself; but there is no need of this. It mars the parallelism, and makes very difficult the rendering of the second clause, which then must be taken in the same way.

[44] Ver. 30. **Whilst darkening;** Taken participially to denote the close conjunction of the two acts. Lit., *and He covers*, that is, with darkness, as the context demands. The object covered (not that with which he covers) is the roots or depths of the sea. The other rendering is, He covereth himself with the roots of the sea. This is grammatically harsh, and makes the English or German more difficult to understand than the simple Hebrew. Such a rendering, in both clauses, seems prompted by Ps. civ. 2, "He covereth himself with light, although there is no personal or reflex pronoun there. But in that case the verb is עטה, which, more strictly than כִּסָּה, follows, in its government, the analogy of verbs of *clothing, arming, etc.* It is there, moreover, a description of creation, and there is no other object of the verb. Here the design of Elihu is simply to present phenomena, and the language, therefore, is demonstrative and optical instead of reflective. Some take the sense of the light (the lightning) covering the roots of the sea, so vividly that the bottom of the ocean is illuminated. No one, however, ever saw that, and it would have been wholly imaginative in Elihu, instead of an appeal to things visible, and conceivable by all. Again, *the roots of the sea*, say some, is the water drawn up, though once lying in the depths (ver. 27), and God has a robe of double texture woven of light and the waters, or the darkness of the waters. We may doubt whether the mind of Elihu in this grand *optical* description was in the mood for such a fine-spun conceit. Everything, too, both here and in the next chapter, goes to show that he spoke under the vivid emotion of an actual storm then making its approach in the distance. There is a contrast undoubtedly between the two clauses of ver. 30, but it is one which every black thunder-storm presents, especially to those who view it, or conceive it, in connection with the vicinity of waters. It is the bright blazing in the heavens, and the dark *horror*, as the poet calls it, which it makes upon the face of the sea. See how Virgil pictures the the two things together, Æn. I., 90—89,

——*Micat ignibus* æther,—
——ponto *Nox* incubat *atra*.

Again Æn. III., 199—194:

——Ingeminant abruptis nubibus *ignes*,—
——Et *inhorruit* unda *tenebris*.

So Homer's Odyss. V., 294:

——ὀρώρει δ' οὐρανόθεν νύξ,—
And night rushed down the sky.

[45] Ver. 32. **O'er either hand.** The Dual, כַּפַּיִם.

[46] Ver. 32. **Doth he wrap.** כִּסָּה has here both its direct and remote object, and the sense is unmistakable. The light here is the lightning. It is the figure of the slinger

And giveth it commandment where[47] to strike.
33 Of this the[48] crashing roar[49] makes quick report,
While frightened herds announce the ascending[50] flame.

gathering up the cord around his hands, and taking a firm hold that he may hurl the weapon the more forcibly, as well as more surely. For that purpose he takes it with both hands. If it is plain, it is exceedingly sublime.

[47] Ver. 32. **Where to strike.** מַפְגִּיעַ, Hiphil participle here, admirably expresses the opposing object, that which comes in the way or *causes* a meeting. It seems strange that DELITZSCH should say that the Hiphil sense is lost in such rendering. He himself makes it, not the *object*, but the *aimer*, by virtue of the all-explaining *beth essentiæ*. The participle thus used as object becomes synonymous with מִפְגָּע vii. 20, only it is better here as more easily admitting the personificative idea, as though the thing hit were regarded, for the moment, as the adversary against whom the bolt is hurled. The verb in this Hiphil form appears most expressively Isai. liii. 12, וְלַפֹּשְׁעִים יַפְגִּיעַ, "and He (the Redeemer) *interposed* for the transgressors"—came between them and the bolt of justice, so that it might fall on Him. From the very nature of the verb פגע, its Kal and Hiphil must be very much alike in their general significance; the latter being only the more intensive. It is, in this respect, like the kindred verb פגש, to meet, in which Kal, Piel, and even Niphal present nearly the same idea.

[48] Ver. 33. **Of this.** עָלָיו; that is, the *mark*, the *thing hit*, or the fact of hitting. Those who refer the pronoun to God, as in the other cases above, get into great confusion. It turns away the thought from the optical, or the direct picture, on which the speaker seems intent, to a kind of moralizing out of place and interrupting the effect.

[49] Ver. 33. **The crashing roar.** An error in respect to עָלָיו leads to a false view of רֵעַ, or to the rendering *friend*, or *thought*, as some take it, whilst it so obviously means the sharp sound of the thunder when the lightning strikes near. See the use of it, Exod. xxiii. 17 for the wild *cheering* or *uproar* of the camp, and especially Micah iv. 9. The latter place leaves no doubt of its meaning, or of its derivation, לָמָּה תָרִיעִי רֵעַ, *lamma tha-ringni reangh*, if we give to the ע something of that nasal tone with which the modern Jews pronounce it: "*Why ringest thou out, breakest thou out, with that roaring cry*, quare vociferaris *vociferando?*" רֵעַ is onomatopically like רִנָּה, only its guttural, especially if there is something nasal in it, makes it better adapted to represent a rough, hoarse, roaring, crashing sound, in which everything seems breaking to pieces. When in a thunderstorm there is heard that peculiar crash simultaneous with the vivid lightning blaze, we say immediately, *that* has struck somewhere, and very near. It immediately *announces* the effect, such as is not expected when the thunder is distant, though it may be very heavy, and the lightning very vivid. Hence we call it a *report*. הִגִּיד well expresses this—*tells*—*declares*—puts it before us (נֶגֶד) in a way we cannot doubt.

[50] Ver. 33. **The ascending flame.** Here is another example where the most literal following of the words in their most literal sense, but with a sharp look to the context, furnishes the best guide in the interpretation. מִקְנֶה אַף עַל עוֹלֶה, *the* herds, *even of the ascending:* Unchanged the words give that and nothing else. עַל is to be taken as just before in עָלָיו. There it is, "make report *of* it," that is, the *striking*. Here it is a making report (for יַגִּיד belongs to both clauses) of something else described as עוֹלֶה (*ascendens*), *de* surgente, or *de* ascendente. But what is it that *goeth up?* This is to be determined by the context, and the use of the participle עוֹלֶה in other passages of Scripture, or of the verb from which it comes. Connecting it with the lightning stroke in the first clause we can hardly help thinking of Gen. xix. 28, where "the smoke of Sodom" is pictured as "*going up*, (עָלָה), like the smoke of a furnace," or of Joshua viii. 20, וְהִנֵּה עָלָה עֲשַׁן הָעִיר, "and lo, there *went up* the smoke of the city." For similar imagery see Judg. xx. 40; Jerem. xlviii. 15, and other places. The name, too, given to the burnt offering, עֹלָה, with only a change of vowel to make it a participial noun, presents the same image. It is so called because of the smoke ascending high in the air from the altar of incense and sacrifice. Comp. Gen. viii. 20, the ascent of Noah's offering; also such passages as Lev. vi. 2, הָעֹלָה הָעוֹלָה עַל מוֹקְדָה, Ezek. viii. 11, עֲנַן הַקְּטֹרֶת עוֹלֶה, "the cloud of incense *going up*." These passages are cited to show how easy and natural the image, and how difficult it is, in such a context to associate it with any other. Other views require changes in the text; for example, instead of מִקְנֶה, some would read מְקַנֶּה, and then demand that it be regarded as equivalent to מְקַנֵּא governing אַף (as a noun) and making it mean, arousing jealous wrath. This to make any sense requires עַוְלָה (fem. of עָוֶל) *wickedness*, and also that עַל should have the sense *against;* thus taking it out of the obvious parallelism with עָלָיו in the first clause. They say, too, אַף is in the wrong place for it as a particle,—it should have come at the beginning of the clause. But the briefest consultation of NOLDIUS' *Concord. Partic.* would show that this is futile. See 2 Sam. xx. 14; Cant. i. 16; 1 Sam. ii. 7; Isai. xxvi. 9; Ps. lxx. 15, *etc.* It is frequently, as we here find it, when emphasizing a word as it emphasizes עַל עוֹלֶה, "*even* of that which goeth up." Others take the text as it stands, but refer עוֹלֶה to God. But this is very difficult. God does not go up in the storm. Still less fitting is the rendering *im Anzug, on his approach* (DELITZSCH) or *im Zuge* (EWALD), *on the march.* עוֹלֶה is never used in such a way. Some of the Jewish commentators regard it as equivalent to עַל, a supposed name of God, Hos. xii. 27, or to עֶלְיוֹן,—the Most High, so frequently used in Genesis; but that denotes position, *height as rank*, not *ascension* in any way. Some, following ABEN EZRA, refer it to the *rising* storm, and the cattle foreboding its approach; but that disorders the time, and takes us away from the scene so vividly painted as present to the imagination at least, if not to the actual sense of the persons addressed. It is something startling, as is shown by the close connection with the 1st verse of ch. xxxvii., and which any such retrospective reflections of the speaker would interrupt and impair. Others render רֵעַ friend: SCHLOTTMANN, Er zeigt ihm seinen Freund—Zorneseifer über die Frevler; but that besides requiring two changes in the text of the second clause, seems a sort of reflective moralizing which would hardly come between such vivid description preceding and immediately following. It seems too forced to be capable of defence even by the reasoning of so excellent a commentator as SCHLOTTMANN. UMBREIT renders רֵעַ in the same way; but in the second clause goes very far off in rendering עוֹלֶה das gewachs, the *plant*, for which the places he cites Gen. xl. 10; xli. 22, furnish no warrant. Even if ever used in the Bible for a plant, it would be unmeaning here, and the construction he gives altogether ungrammatical. The epithet *frightened*, in the translation, gives only what is clearly implied, if the view taken of the passage be coreect, and so is it used by RENAN, though referring it to the cattle's foreboding of an approaching storm:

L'effroi des tropeaux revele son approche.

Others content themselves with rendering simply and safely *de surgente*, or *de ascendente*,, without any attempt at explanation. But what is that which goeth up after the crash and the striking of the lightning? Not unfrequently do we witness what ought to give us the idea. It is when the lightning strikes anything that is highly combustible, a barn with grain, a stack of dry sheaves in the field, or, as it often does, the dry trees of the forest. It could not have been uncommon on the plains of Uz. In such a case the smoke and flame rise up almost immediately from the fierce combustion. A sight of this kind strongly associates itself in the mind of the translator, with the study of this passage. During a storm of terrific blackness a most blinding flash of zigzag chain lightning came down over a near hill. The terrible crash was simultaneous with it, and hardly had the reverberation ceased when up rose from a barn behind the

hill a lurid column of pitchy smoke and flame ascending perpendicularly towards the heavens, like that which went up from the blasted plain of Sodom. It was, indeed, an awful sight, and had the fleeing cattle formed part of the scene, it would have been in closest conformity with the picture so vividly presented to us in these few Hebrew words. Taken as a whole, this portion of Elihu's speech (vers. 27–33) suggests most of the ideas which are prominent in VIRGIL's description of the thunder-storm, Georg. I. 328:

> Ipse Pater, *media nimborum in nocte*, corusca
> Fulmina *molitur dextra.*———
> *fugere feræ*, et mortalia corda
> Per gentes humilis stravit pavor; ille *flagranti*
> Aut Atho, aut Rhodopen, aut alta Ceraunia, *telo*
> Dejicit; ingeminant Austri et densissimus imber.

With the 4th and 5th lines of the above, compare Ps. civ. 32; *He touches the* mountains and *they smoke.* The difficulty of the passage gives the apology for so long dwelling upon it.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

1 At such a sight,[1] with shuddering fear my heart
Leaps wildly[2] from its place.
2 Hear ye, O hear the roaring[3] of His voice,
The deep reverberation[4] from His mouth;
3 As under all the heavens He sends[5] it forth,—
His lightning to the edges[6] of the earth.
4 Then after it resounds a voice,
The glorious voice[7] with which He thundereth.
One cannot trace[8] them when their sound is heard.
5 Yes, with His voice[9] God thunders marvellously;
Great things does He; we understand Him not.
6 For to the snow He saith, be thou[10] upon the earth;

[1] Ver. 1. **At such a sight.** אף לזאת, *yea at this.* There is intimated the closest connection with what precedes.

[2] Ver. 1. **Leaps wildly.** נתר, *trepidavit, palpitavit.* In Piel it denotes the sudden leap of the locust.

[3] Ver. 2. **Roaring.** רֹגֶז· The first loud, rough crash.

[4] Ver. 2. **Reverberation.** The succeeding sound, loud, yet lower in tone, literally *muttering, rumbling, etc.*, deep barytone, like a low murmuring voice.

[5] Ver. 3. **Sends it forth.** Not from ישר *to direct*, but from שרה to *set free, let loose.*

[6] Ver. 3. **Edges.** Literally, *wings, extremities.*

[7] Ver. 4. **Glorious voice.** Lit., *voice of his glory.* To avoid the tautology, in the 3d clause it is rendered *sound.*

[8] Ver. 4. **Cannot trace them,** יְעַקְּבֵם. GESENIUS gives it the sense *retardavit*, citing the Arabic (Conj. II.) which does not support him, since it simply means coming behind (pressit vestigia). DELITZSCH, following GESENIUS, renders, und spart die Blitze nicht; SCHLOTTMANN. nicht zogern die Blitze; UMBREIT, und er hält's nicht zurück. On the other hand EWALD gives it the sense of *finding, tracing, investigating*, though he seems to regard as its object the men to be punished, for which there is no authority. This, too, is the rendering of the VULGATE (*non investigatur*, taken impersonally), of Symmachus, and of the Peschito, which uses the very word, and with the sense of *investigating, tracing, tracking*, which it always has in Syriac. See the numerous examples in N. T., and especially Acts xvii. 27, *seeking* after God and tracing Him (מעקבין used for the Greek ψηλαφήσειαν, *feel after*). So among the older commentators. עקב is a denominative or noun verb, and all its uses are easily traceable from the primary sense of עָקֵב *the heel;* such as *to go behind one (at his heels)*, to *supplant*, or trip the heel; hence to retard (impedire) should the context demand it. The most natural idea, however, belonging to the Piel, (as to the Syriac Pael) is that of *tracking. investigating* (from *vestigium*, a *footstep*). The same metaphor appears in the nouns; as in עקבות, Cant. i. 8; Ps. lxxxix. 52, and especially, as strongly suggested by this, Ps. lxxvii. 20: "Thy way is in the many waters, and thy footsteps (or thy tracings עִקְּבוֹתֶיךָ, *vestigia tua*) are *unknown*," *untraceable.* Here, however, it must be taken indefinitely as in the VULGATE: *One cannot trace them*, that is, the thunder voices. In giving the verb the sense of *holding back*, DELITZSCH and UMBREIT make *lightnings* the object. But thunders, mentioned just before, is more properly the grammatical object, especially in the sense above given. The reference is to the rolling or reverberating thunder, "under the whole heavens," or all round the sky; unlike the sharp crash of the striking bolt which immediately announces itself (xxxvi. 33). It seems to be every where. We hear but cannot trace it.

[9] Ver. 5. **With his voice.** The repetitions of the word קול are somewhat remarkable, although the Hebrew seems to allow such a thing better than the English. It may be regarded as coming from the anxiety of Elihu to impress the idea that the thunder in the storm now raging around them, is really, and not metaphorically merely, the voice of God impressing itself in the undulations of the air. This idea of an actual thunder-storm coming up, subsiding or passing off, gathering again (as seems to be represented in the two chapters) and finally terminating in the tornado from which breaks forth the unmistakable voice of God, furnishes a clue to much that is peculiar in the style of this portion of Elihu's speech. Especially in ch. xxxvii. does he talk like a man amazed and awed by the approach of terrible phenomena. In the intervals of subsidence, he moralizes as men are wont to do at such seasons. Every few moments his attention seems called to some new appearance, interrupting and confusing his language: "See there"—"hear that," *etc.* A darkness comes up, and he "cannot speak by reason of it" (ver. 19); it passes away and his eyes are drawn to a strange electric light approaching from the North. For this effect of the storm on Elihu's speech, see INT. THEISM, pp. 25, 26, 27, and note.

[10] Ver. 6. **Be thou upon the earth.** DELITZSCH, falle erdwärts. In thus rendering הֱוֵא, he goes to the Arabic הוי, *decidit, delapsus fuit.* GESENIUS, *rue in terram;* but as CONANT well says, "this very poorly expresses the gentle falling of the snow." Its quiet descent has ever given, in fact, its most poetical image. Homer uses it Il. III. 222, to represent the steady persuasion of true eloquence:

> Καὶ ἔπεα νιφάδεσσιν ἐοικότα χειμερίῃσιν,

which Bryant so exactly as well as beautifully renders:

> "And words came like the flakes of winter snow."

Thus also to the pouring[11] rain,
His mighty[12] flooding rain.
7 The hand of every man He sealeth[13] up;
That all may know—all men whom He has[14] made.
8 Then go the beasts,[15] each to his hiding place;
And in their dens abide.
9 From the dark[16] South proceeds the[17] sweeping storm,
From the Mezarim[18] comes the chilling blast.
10 From God's own breath the hoar frost[19] is congealed;
By it the water's breadth is firmly[20] bound.
11 Through drenching[21] rain the dense cloud He exhausts,
The thin light-breaking[22] cloud He scattereth.

See Lucian's allusion to this, Eulogy of Demosthenes, sec. 15. A modern hymnist uses it for its soothing or sedative effect. SCHLOTTMANN regards הֱוֵא as simply the imperative of the Hebrew substantive verb in its older form: Sei auf erden, LXX., *γίνου ἐπὶ γῆς*.

11 Ver. 6. **Pouring rain.** גֶּשֶׁם (*geshem*) as its very sound seems to indicate (*gush, giessen*) denotes the heavy rain when it seems to descend in floods, or almost in a *body* (Arabic גשם *jism*) as it were, or like a mass or weight (Arabic גשם josham).

12 Ver. 6. **Flooding rain.** Lit. *pouring of rains of his strength.* In a compound expression of this kind, the Hebrew puts the pronominal suffix, generally, to the last noun, and uses it like an adjective.

13 Ver. 7. **Sealeth up.** Confines them to their homes during the storms, that, under shelter, they may think of God's works, and give Him glory. Comp. Ps. xxix., where there is a like description of a thunder-storm as witnessed from the sheltering temple: "He maketh bare the forests," whilst, at every thunder peal, "every one who sits in his temple אֹמֵר כָּבוֹד, is crying, glory." The scenic state here is not easily determined. but they were all probably in the shelter of a tent.

14 Ver. 7. **Whom He has made.** Lit. *men of his work.* Some would make a change in the text, אנשים for אנשי, so as to make it like xxxiii. 17, *that every man may know His work.* But all that is expressed there is implied here, without a change, whilst there is the additional idea that men too are His work.

15 Ver. 8. **The beasts.** חַיָּה, here, is taken both collectively and distributively.

16 Ver. 9. **The dark South.** הַחֶדֶר, *the chamber*, is an elliptical expression for the South. See its full form, חַדְרֵי תֵימָן, *chambers of the South*, ix. 10. EWALD: *The secret chamber.* See Note 7 to xxiii. 9. It was the region in which thunder-storms arose.

17 Ver. 9. **Sweeping storm.** סוּפָה, *the sweeping storm*, as distinguished from סְעָרָה the *tornado.*

18 Ver. 9. **Mezarim.** The word is left untranslated. It evidently means the North, though on what grounds is not easily seen. Lit., *the scatterers*, and DELITZSCH refers it to the boreal winds that *disperse* the clouds and bring clear cold weather. It is not the Mazzaroth of xxxviii. 22.

19 Ver. 10. **The hoar frost is congealed.** Lit. *it gives;* but the Hebrew יִתֵּן, is used as a substantive verb, like the German *es gibt*, for any mode by which the event is brought about. קֶרַח is generally rendered *ice*, but that does not suit well the figure of *breath. Hoar frost* gives just the image: frozen vapor or moisture, such as that of descending dew, or of the breath congealing on a cold day as it is exhaled from the mouth. Ice, however, as the product of breath is not any easy conception. Congealed moisture may be taken as the general idea, whatever may be the degree or form of congelation as determined by the context. For this reason, in Job vi. 16, we have rendered it sleet (*frozen rain*) as agreeing best with the darkened floods and the snowflakes disappearing as they fall into them. The rendering *crystal*, Ezek. i. 32, is not primary, but comes from the sense of ice, which this word unquestionably has where the context demands it, as in xxxviii. 29, with its general words of production or generation. Frost, there, comes in the second clause (כְּפֹר the hoar frost, from the idea of *covering*, or overspreading, as the manna (Exod. xvi. 14). In Gen. xxxi. 40, and Jer. xxxv. 30, קֶרַח is used generally for cold, as is shown by its being, in both places, the antithesis of חֹרֶב, *heat.* So קָרָה, Prov. xxv. 30: בְּיוֹם קָרָה, *in die frigoris.*

20 Ver. 20. **Firmly bound.** מוּצָק from יצק *to pour, to become fused.* Hence the idea of *something* metallic that becomes solid from a molten state: It comes more directly, however, if we can regard יצק as deriving one of its senses from the cognate יָצַג, *stabilivit*, or suppose מוּצָג = מוּצָק or מֻצָּג. Compare מָצָק, xl. 15, מוּצָק xxxviii. 38. Akin to these are the derivatives from צוּק, as מָצוּק *columna*, 1 Sam. ii. 8 מְצֻקֵי אֶרֶץ, and especially 1 Sam. xiv. 15, where it seems to denote a basaltic pillar of rock, so named from the appearance of *fusion* such rocks obviously present. בְּמוּצָק here is a clear case of the *beth essentiæ.*

21 Ver. 11. **Drenching rain.** Copious effusion. This verse has occasioned much difficulty. בְּרִי has been derived from ברה taken as equivalent to ברר, and rendered *purity, clearness, serenity.* Then it has been taken as the subject of יַטְרִיחַ in its Arabic sense *projecit, etc.:* The serenity, or brightness (the clearing up), drives away, or precipitates the thick thunder-cloud. But this makes the two clauses express the same or a very similar idea. Others (like E. V.), take בְּ as a preposition, and רִי as an abbreviation of רְוִי, like כִּי (*burning*) for כְּוִי. Such an abbreviation would be still more likely with the preposition: בְּרִי for בִּרְוִי. The Arabic word רי *copiosa irrigatio* is just like it, and comes in just the same way from רוי. This makes a clear and suitable sense which is supported by E. V., and the majority, perhaps, of authorities. Some who take this sense of רִי, however, altogether change the idea by giving יטריח the sense of loading or putting a load upon (*with copious rain He loads the cloud*) resorting to the Arabic word from which no such idea can be fairly abstracted. The sense, however, which the context demands, comes very easily from the Hebrew idea of טֹרַח, namely, *weariness* as in Deut. i. 12, and Isai. i. 14, the only places where it occurs, but abundantly sufficient to fix its meaning. The idea of load is only passive or subjective, especially as it appears in the latter passage. The primary idea is *molestia, defatigatio*, and hence, *exhaustion;* by the copious flooding. He exhausts the עָב or the dense heavy cloud. There would be an incongruity in the idea of loading (*charging*) the cloud by irrigation. That of exhaustion gives just the sense that best fits the whole verse, and this E. V. has well expressed by "*He wearieth.*"

22 Ver. 11. **Light-breaking cloud.** The clouds through which the light is breaking. Heb. literally, *cloud of his light.* עֲנַן being in the construct state it cannot be rendered, *His light disperses the cloud*, though that would be a good sense, and in harmony with the general idea of the whole verse. There is, moreover, an evident contrast between עָב, the dark dense storm cloud, and עָנָן, the ordinary cloud, the cloud as it usually floats in the atmosphere,

12 In circling[23] changes is it thus transformed,[24]
By His wise laws,[25] that they may execute
All His commands o'er all the sphere of[26] earth;
13 Whether as punishment, or for His land,
Or in His mercy He appointeth[27] it.
14 O Job! give ear to this;
Be still and contemplate God's wondrous works.
15 Knowest thou how over these Eloah laid His laws,
Or from the cloudy darkness[28] streams the light?
16 Knowest thou the poisings[29] of the cloud,
The wondrous works of Him whose knowledge has no bound?
17 (Or how it is) what time thy robes are warm;
When from the South the land in sultry[30] stillness rests?
18 Dost thou with Him spread out the skies
So strong—so like[31] a molten mirror smooth?
19 O teach us what to say!
We cannot speak aright[32],—so dark it grows.[33]

"the morning cloud," Hos. vi., or "the passing cloud," Job vii. 9. The contrast is lost in many renderings. Its preservation, and the clear calling to mind of the phenomena that attend the breaking up of a heavy thunder-storm, lead us out of all difficulty. The symptom that the shower is nearly over is generally a sudden and unusual outpouring as though the עָב or nimbus was *emptying itself* of all its contents. Very soon the clouds assume a lighter appearance. We say it is beginning to clear up, and in a short time we see them in motion with the light breaking out of them, and through them in all directions. אוֹר is indeed used for the lightning in a number of places, but here it would seem to be taken in its ordinary sense. Even should we render it *His lightning cloud*, as Dr. CONANT does, it would make no great difference in the general view: the cloud or clouds out of which His lightning had been playing. It is, however, more literal and more easy to render it as it stands, *the cloud of His light*—His illumined cloud, his light or lightsome cloud now almost transparent instead of dark and dense. The distinction is well given in the Article on Clouds, Am. Encyclopedia: "The nimbus (the עָב here) having discharged its moisture, the lighter forms of clouds appear (the *cirrus* in some of its modifications), whilst the fragments of the nimbus are borne along by the winds." There is a resemblance to this picture in the interpretation of the old commentators MERCERUS and DRUSIUS. Hanc appellat *nubem lucis Dei*, nubem qua dispulsa, lux et serenitas inducitur.

[23] Ver. 12. **In circling changes.** מֵסַב, *a circuit, a revolving*. It is, however, in causality, rather than in space movement. The latter idea of a turning round, or over, of the cloud, gives no clear meaning here. In the kindred word סִבָּה, as used 1 Kings xii. 15 (2 Chron. x. 15, נְסִבָּה representing the same thing), it denotes a political revolution, a *bringing about* of events by a combination of physical and moral means, yet still, as here, ascribed to God's agency, as though the Scriptures made little of our distinction between natural and supernatural causation. It is here the *series* of changes through which these phenomena occur, taking in the whole process, from His "drawing up of the water drops," xxxvi. 27, the distilling from vapor to rain, ver. 28, to the discharge and clearing up of the storm as described in the verse above.

[24] Ver. 12. **Transformed.** מִתְהַפֵּךְ may refer to the cloud thus formed, or to the event as it comes out of this circuitous causation bringing things back to their former state. See note on the Niphal נֶהְפַּךְ, xxviii. 5, and the Hophal הָהְפַּךְ xxx. 15. The Hithpahel מִתְהַפֵּךְ may sometimes present the idea of changes in space and motion, as in Gen. iii. 24, but in this place, and xxxviii. 14, the general idea of *transformation*, metamorphosis, or the causal turning of one thing, or one phenomenon, into another is to be preferred.

[25] Ver. 12. **Wise laws.** תַּחְבּוּלֹתָיו. The uses of this word in such places as Prov. i. 5; xi. 14; xx. 18, where it is parallel with מַחְשָׁבוֹת, *thoughts, designs*, and עֵצָה, *consilium* (see also Prov. xxiv. 6), make it very clear. In regard to physical things it means just what we call *laws* (*God's thoughts*) though with a less pious meaning. The etymological image is in harmony with this as derived from the primary sense of the verb חבל to bind (noun חֶבֶל a rope or string). תחבולות, *things or events tied together*. God's counsels in the *ligatures, linkings*, or *concatenations* of nature.

[26] Ver. 12. **Sphere of earth.** Lit., *the world-earth*: The earth and the skies belonging to it, above and around it. For this use of תֵּבֵל see 1 Sam. ii. 8; Ps. xviii. 16; xciii. 1; Ps. xc. 2, ארץ ותבל, and Prov. viii. 31, תֵּבֵל ארצו. "The habitable earth," Dr. CONANT renders it. It has this sense sometimes, and it may be more proper here; but the prominent presence of aerial phenomena seems to justify the wider rendering: *the terrestrial world*.

[27] Ver. 13. **He appointeth it.** DELITZSCH renders יַמְצִאֵהוּ, "He caused it to discharge itself," that is the cloud. It is an unnecessary loading of the sense beyond the requirements of מצא, which, in Hiphil, is sometimes used in the manner of a substantive verb—to make a thing present, that is to make, to be, as in Job xxxiv. 11. From this comes the frequent Rabbinical usage of מצא as a verb of existence.

[28] Ver. 15. **Cloudy darkness.** This rendering is given to עָנָן, not only as suiting the etymological idea, *covering, overspreading*, but also as best suggesting the wonder, or seeming miracle intended: the brilliant light radiating from so dark a source, like the sparks from the flint.

[29] Ver. 16. **Knowest thou the poisings.** Comp. xxviii. 25, 26, and notes: the law for the rain. Here, as in xxxvi. 29, the wonder presented is that of the cloud remaining balanced in the air with its heavy watery load.

[30] Ver. 17. **In sultry stillness rests:** Compare Isaiah xviii. 4: "I *am still* (אשקטה), and look out in my place, as when the dry heat is in the air, or like the cloud of dew in the heat of harvest." The South, the region of heat and thunder-storms.

[31] Ver. 18. **So like a molten mirror smooth.** The true point of the comparison is lost when we connect כ with חזקים. It rather refers to תרקיע, and the resemblance is, not in the strength, but in the expansion or apparent smoothness.

[32] Ver. 19. **Cannot speak aright.** Lit., *cannot arrange* (*words*) by reason of (*or before*) the darkness. If there were nothing else, this would naturally be interpreted of mental darkness. So RENAN, who, however, gives a very fine rendering:

Mais plutôt, taisons-nous, ignorants que nous sommes.

But the thought again suggests itself that this is a real

20 Ah, is it told[34] to Him that I am speaking!
Has one so said?[35] take care lest he be swallowed up.

21 And now the lightning[36] they no longer see,—
That splendor[37] in the clouds;[38]
The wind has passed and made them clear.

scene. It is a real darkness perturbing his thoughts and disturbing his utterance. It may be a coming back of the nimbus as is the case sometimes in thunder-storms, or some strange darkening of the air from some unknown cause, and, therefore, more awing than though it came from clouds. Something still more fearful is anticipated. There are symptoms of the סְעָרָה, or whirlwind. And so he turns again from the reflective to the phenomenal style, like that of a man calling attention to some new and strange appearances in the heavens, after the storm has partially passed by.

[33] Ver. 19. **So dark it grows.** Hebrew, literally, *before the darkness*, or *by reason of the darkness*.

[34] Ver. 20. **Ah, is it told to Him.** An overawing sense of an actually approaching divine presence, making even the reverent Elihu fear lest he may have said something rash, as he charges Job to have done. From this his own confession, therefore, we may expect perturbation, confusion, and consequent obscurity in what immediately follows. He "cannot order his speech" or marshall (ערך) his words. He hardly knows what he says, as was the case with the disciples (Mark ix. 6) when they came down from the mount of transfiguration; *οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί λαλήσῃ· ἦσαν γὰρ ἔκφοβοι.*

[35] Ver. 20. **Has one so said?** It is not easy to get a clear meaning to this verse, unless we take כִּי elliptically with some word of caution, such as is sometimes to be supplied before the Greek ὅτι, or μὴ ὅτι, μὴ ὅπως, *take care lest;* or as the Latin *ut* is used as a caution, with some such word understood as *fieri potest*, or the like: it may be *that* he will be swallowed up. Among other places a good example of this elliptical כי may be found, Deut. vii. 17: כִּי תֹאמַר בִּלְבָבְךָ *take care lest thou say in thy heart.* It is an idiom which would be especially likely to occur in impassioned language, such as Elihu uses in his confessed perturbation. RENAN renders it very freely, and supposes that the reference is to Job's rash language in demanding that God would appear and speak to him.

De grâce, que mes discours ne lui soient point rapportes!
Jamais homme a-t-il désiré sa perte?

[36] Ver. 21. **The lightning.** The question on which turns the whole interpretation of this and the following verse, is whether אוֹר here means the sun, or the lightning. Most commentators say the former. There are, however, strong objections to it regarded in itself, and they become still stronger in the attempt to make any application of such a meaning. It certainly seems against it that whilst אור is used for the sun in but one clear place in the Bible, Job xxx. 26 (two other places cited, Hab. iii. 4; Isai. xviii. 4, being better rendered by the general term *light*) there are no less than five passages in this very description (xxxvi. 27—xxxvii. 24), and in close connection, where it is used for the *lightning*. They are xxxvi. 32; xxxvii. 3, 11, 15, about which there can be no doubt, and xxxvi. 30, where it makes the clearest sense. It is certainly the predominant meaning of אור in these two chapters. The word עַתָּה, too, seems to be taken in its temporal sense: *at the present time, now*, in distinction from something past; as is also denoted by the demonstrative הוּא in the second clause, *the splendor that was in the skies, or clouds.* Such a definition would not have been appended had the sun been meant, or light generally. It conveys the impression of something peculiar that had been very lately seen. The same effect is produced on the mind by the third clause: "*the wind has passed and cleared them;*" the storm is just over; an assertion which seems to have no meaning in connection with the mere general reflection supposed to be expressed by this verse. The strongest argument, however, is that the rendering controverted stands wholly isolated. It seems to refer to nothing that precedes, and has no application to any thing following, except what is wholly inferential, or is to be supplied by each interpreter's own critical imagination. The analogy is certainly not expressed or even hinted at. The very modes of applying the fact supposed to be stated only render such interpretations all the more unsatisfactory. The principal one is that cited by SCHLOTTMANN, from RABBI SIMEON BEN ZEMACH, and which is adopted by most of the Jewish interpreters: "As men cannot look upon the sun in the heavens without being blinded, so they cannot judge of the works of God." This demands a potential sense for ראו, without any authority. The idea is indeed a good one, but wholly supplied from the commentator's own mind. Others, like DELITZSCH, refer it to the passing away of the storm as denoted in the 3d clause, and make the hidden doctrine to be that "as a breath of wind is enough to bring the sun to view, so God, hidden for a time, can suddenly unveil Himself to our surprise and confusion." This may be a true and striking thought, but it is wholly supplied. It has, moreover, no connection with ver. 22, where זהב, whatever it means, cannot be the sun coming from the North. Added to all this is the general objection that such a view represents Elihu as suddenly turning from the demonstrative optical, or phenomenal style, which he has used almost throughout, to a refined *moralizing* in which, after all, he leaves the point of his preceptive comparison, to say the least, very obscure. By referring, on the other hand, אור to the lightning, as it has been five times used in these phenomenal picturings, we get a clear sense, in closest harmony with what follows in ver. 22, and giving a consistent meaning to the 3d clause of ver. 21 which occasions so much difficulty in adapting it to the other interpretations; for if it means the sun appearing after a storm, then men do see it, and hail its appearance, and this is wholly at war with the application of RABBI SIMEON which SCHLOTTMANN cites. The key to the irregular language of both these chapters is found when we regard Elihu not as moralizing, or drawing on his imagination, but as describing real appearances in the heavens, the skies, the clouds (for שחקים may have all these meanings) just as they occur. EWALD, SCHLOTTMANN, DELITZSCH, all admit that the storm or סופה, terminating in the סערה or whirlwind, out of which the Divine voice proceeds, is actually occurring during Elihu's speech. The latter draws this conclusion from xxxvii. 1, dass die Gewitter-schilderung Elihu's von einem den Himmel überziehenden Gewitter begleitet ist, from which he justly infers that עַתָּה, ver. 21, must be understood in its temporal, instead of its mere conclusive sense: "*Now*, at this present time, *they do not see the light, etc.* So SCHLOTTMANN, remarking on the article in הסערה, xxxviii. 1, puts it on the ground, dass das bestimmte Wetter gemeint ist dessen Heraufziehen schon Elihu geschildert hatte. He means the painting which commences xxxvi. 27, and was most probably suggested by the symptoms of the thunder at that time beginning to show themselves. This makes it all the more strange that these commentators should have made so little use, or rather no use at all, of this important circumstance in their interpretation of vers. 21 and 22. If ver. 21 presents an actual scene then present to the beholders, instead of a mere moralizing imagination, then every thing becomes easy, and a most obvious preparation is furnished for ver. 22. The סופה or thunder-storm has passed by; they see no longer the lightning in the clouds; they are broken up (xxxvii. 11); "the wind has passed and made them clear. But see! Something else is coming (יאתה ver. 22, future of approach) from the opposite direction, and all eyes are intently fixed upon it. What this is we are told in the next verse.

[37] Ver. 21. **That splendor, בָּהִיר הוּא.** The Arabic בהר has the primary sense of splendor, but it is almost lost in its numerous secondary applications. We get a better idea of the root from the Hebrew noun בַּהֶרֶת, which comes so frequently in the minute description of the leprosy, Lev. xiii. and xiv. It is the "inflamed" pustule of a "*reddish color*," which the LXX. constantly renders by words denoting brilliancy and burning, *πυῤῥίζουσα—κατάκαυμα πυρὸς—αὐγάζον* and similar words—VULGATE *combustio*—all leaving no doubt as to its appearance: a fiery red (Heb. אֲדַמְדֶּמֶת) or *inflamed spot.* In analogy with this, the adjective בהיר would mean a blazing, angry, radiating splendor, suggestive of the red lightning glow, though it might be applied to the sun if the context demanded.

[38] Ver. 21. **In the clouds.** This word שחקים may be used either for the *clouds* or *the skies.* If the sun were intended it would be more properly בשמים, as the sun is never elsewhere said to be בשחקים.

22 From the North[39] it comes, a golden[40] sheen;
O, with Eloah there is awful majesty!
23 The Almighty One! we cannot find Him out;
So vast His power!
So full of truth and right; He'll not[41] oppress.
24 For this do men hold Him in reverence;
For He regardeth not the wise of heart.[42]

[39] Ver. 22. **From the North.** The opposite direction to that from which comes the סופה.

[40] Ver. 22. **A golden sheen.** זהב. Lit., *gold.* From the context there cannot be a doubt that by this word Elihu means an appearance of a peculiar kind in the heavens, and approaching them from the North. It is something that combines the *beautiful*, as we may judge from the name he gives it, with the *terrible*. That there was something of this fearful fascination about it is evident from the sudden cry which it calls out: *with God is dreadful majesty;* or as RENAN most expressively renders it:

O admirable splendeur de Dieu!

It would have been out of place had he been calmly moralizing, and drawing refined analogies, as the other interpretations represent him. *He saw something.* It was this which made him cry out. Nothing but some wonderful glory before his eyes, something that filled him at the same time with admiration and alarm, could have called out such an exclamation. זהב here cannot represent the sun, (though *aureus* or *golden* would be a good descriptive epithet of it) since it comes from the North. The Future יאתה, too, would be out of place, from its so evidently denoting approach. There is no ground for rendering it *fair weather*, as E. V. and others have done. Why should Elihu make a general reflection here about the weather, and what was there in such an idea to bring out that sudden cry of wonder and alarm? The literal rendering *gold* is the most preposterous of all. That he should stop in the midst of such a splendid storm painting (Gewitterschilderung) to express an opinion in metallurgy is more incredible than his supposed meteorological ideas about the weather; or that under such circumstances he should interrupt his speech in order to tell his hearers that gold comes from the North. All the learning about the "Arimaspian mountains" with their fabled treasures, and Indian stories of guarding griffins, a kind of lore that UMBREIT and MERX are so fond of displaying, cannot redeem it from absurdity. Such a mode of interpretation is specially unsatisfactory when an attempt is made to find a contrast, or a comparison, in the two members of ver. 22: The gold buried in the North and God's unsearchableness; or, as DELITZSCH says, "man lays bare the hidden treasures of the earth, but the wisdom of God still transcends him." How it ignores, too, the pictorial style so evident in the יאתה of the first clause, and the strong emotional aspect of the second! The reference to chap. xxviii. is wholly out of place; since there the contrast between the Divine and human wisdom is evident throughout to every reader; but here all is optical, with no intimation of any such reflexive ideas as are drawn from it. Every thing goes to show that זהב here must be used to denote a peculiar celestial phenomenon, which no other word could so well describe; a steady, untwinkling brilliancy, having a fascinating yet fearful beauty, not dazzling like the sun, or irritating like the *inflamed* splendor denoted by בהיר. The Hebrew use, in this way, of זהב for color, is not frequent, though there is a very good example of it, Zech. xiv. 12, where זהב denotes the clear shining oil, but the classical usage is most abundant. It shows how easy and natural is the analogy in such applications of the words χρυσὸς, *aurum*, with their derivative adjectives, such as χρυσαυγὴς, *gold gleaming* (see PIND. Olymp. I. 1, χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ). Compare too the epithets most usually applied to gold by the Greek poets, such as καθαρὸς, αἰγλήεις, φαεινὸς, διαυγὴς, στίλβων as Lucian styles it. So in the Latin, *aurora* the morning light, from *aurum* (not from αὔριος ὥρη as some absurdly make it), the clear calm light, in distinction from the blinding light of the meridian sun. Hence our word for the *aurora borealis.* So the Latins used *aureolus* (aureole) to denote the halo round the heads of gods or saints. For this idea of gold as representing the calm and beautiful in distinction from the fierce and inflamed light, see Rev. xxi. 18: "And the city was pure gold, χρυσίον καθαρὸν, like to pure jasper." The rendering of the LXX. νέφη χρυσαυγοῦντα, *gold-gleaming clouds*, has been contemned; but it gives an idea most suitable to the context, as it immediately calls to mind the remarkable appearance described Ezek. i. 4, which of all others, is most suggestive of this. It is a wonder that the resemblance should have been so little noticed by commentators. That, too, comes from the North: "And I beheld, and lo, a whirlwind (רוח סערה), came from the North, and a great cloud of inter-circling flame (מִתְלַקַּחַת not diffusing itself but making a globe of light), and a brightness (or halo) round about it, and in the midst of it, like the color of amber (*quasi species* ELECTRI) from the midst of the cloud." It was God's cherubic chariot, as in Ps. xviii. 11. Some such strange appearance, represented in the distance mainly by its golden color, appears to Elihu as coming from the same direction. Ezekiel calls it (i. 28) "the likeness of the glory of God," and "falls upon his face." Elihu cries out, "O awful glory of Eloah;" and this is followed by no mere sententious wisdom, but by one of those doxologies which appear to have been common to the ancient as well as to the later Arabians: Allah akbar, *God is very great,* incomprehensible, vast in strength and righteousness; He will not oppress. It is an emotional cry called out by a sense of approaching Deity.

[41] Ver. 23. **He'll not oppress.** In the INT. THEISM, page 27 (note), the translator was disposed to regard יַעֲנֶה in Kal as the better reading. A more careful study, however, confirms the common text.

[42] Ver. 24. **Regardeth not the wise of heart.** That is, those who are "wise in their own eyes," or vain of their own wisdom. "No flesh shall glory in His presence." It is a fitting conclusion to such a scene, as it was a most fitting prelude to the voice which soon breaks from the electric splendor of this whirling, inter-circling, cloud of gold.

Chapter XXXVIII.

1 Then Jehovah answered Job out of the whirlwind;[1] and He said:

2 Who is it thus, by words makes counsel[2] dark?
Not knowing[3] what he says?

3 Now like a strong[4] man gird thee up thy loins;
'Tis I who ask thee; show me what thou knowest.
4 Say, where wast thou when earth's deep base I laid?
Declare it if thy science[5] goes so far.
5 Who fixed its measurements, that thou[6] should'st know;
Or on it stretched the line?
6 On what were its foundations sunk?
Who laid its corner-stone?
7 When morning stars in chorus[7] sang;
And cried aloud for joy, the sons of God.
8 Or who shut up the sea with doors,
When it gushed forth—when from the womb it came?
9 What time I made its raiment of the cloud,
The dark araphel[8] for its swaddling band?
10 When I broke[9] over it my law,
And set its bars and doors?
11 And said, thus far, no farther, shalt thou come;
And here it stops[10]—the swelling of thy waves?

[1] Ver. 1. **The whirlwind.** See Addenda, Exc. XII., p. 213.

[2] Ver. 2. **Makes counsel dark.** On the question: to whom is this addressed, or of whom spoken. See Exc. XII., p. 213.

[3] Ver. 2. **Not knowing what he says.** The accents separate מלים from בלי דעת. The general sense, however, is the same. See Exc. XII., p. 213.

[4] Ver. 3. **Now like a strong man.** A turning from Elihu to Job. For reasons for this view, see Exc. XII., p. 213.

[5] Ver. 4. **If thy science goes so far.** This may seem a free rendering, but it comes nearer to the meaning of the intensive form ידעת בינה, than the rendering of E. V.: "if thou hast understanding." DELITZSCH's Urtheilsfähigkeit seems to give a very tame senso. Literally it is *know understanding*, that is, with understanding, or *understandingly*, with discernment, or as we would say, scientifically—the reason as well as the fact. EWALD: Verstehst du king zu sein, which seems to have hardly any meaning at all.

[6] Ver. 5. **That thou should'st know.** Some regard this as irony. So RENAN:

Qui a réglé les mesures de la terre (tu le sais sans doute).

There is irony in the Bible, but the idea here is revolting. To say nothing of the theological aspect, it is inconsistent with the frank and encouraging spirit in which Job is invited to the conference (ver. 3d, 2d clause). The rendering above is the most literal, and gives a very satisfactory idea: Who fixed them so that they should fall within the measure of thy science? It is simply a mode of saying, without irony or contempt, that they are far beyond his knowledge. The measures of the earth are not known yet. The North pole is not yet reached. and even should that be accomplished, there is still "the Great Deep," the vast interior all unexplored and likely to remain so for ages we cannot estimate.

[7] Ver. 7. **In chorus.** יחד, *all together—in unison.*

[8] Ver. 9. **The dark araphel.** This word expresses a peculiar conception generally translated "*thick darkness.*" It is something denser than the עב, and darker than אפל. There is in it the idea of dropping or distillation from ערף, as though it were a kind of *flowing* or *floating* darkness, having some degree of black visibility. See Exod. xx. 18; Deut. iv. 11: 2 Kings viii. 2. Ps. xviii. 10: *And the araphel was under His feet.* As the word is well understood to mean intensive darkness, and is itself quite euphonic, it was thought best to leave it untranslated

[9] Ver. 10. **Broke over it my law.** The most literal rendering is the best. Much is lost when we attempt to substitute for it a more general expression. In this word אשבר, there is the idea of something very powerful which the law had to deal with.—something very ungovernable, as though it really taxed the Almighty's strength to keep this new-born sea within bounds. We must not look for any geological science in Job, but this kind of language very readily suggests the idea of immense forces at work in the early nature. The *breaking of the law upon it* represents better than any other linguistic painting could do, its wild stubbornness. It is really the sea breaking itself against law; but there is great vividness, and even sublimity in the converse of the figure. We are reminded by it of PLATO's language (*Myth in the Politicus*) representing God as contending with, and putting forth His strength against, the inherent ungovernableness, and chaotic tendencies of matter. UMBREIT shows great insensibility to the grandeur of this passage in rejecting the common Hebrew sense of שׁבר, and going to the Arabic for the sense of *measuring*, which is only a denominative meaning, and, in the real application, very unsuitable here. ROSENMUELLER is still more out of the way in his effort to make שׁבר equivalent to גזר decree, a sense which this frequent word no where else has in the Hebrew Bible.

[10] Ver. 11. **Stops.** Some take ישית passively, or impersonally. Its active transitive sense, however, may be preserved by regarding חק (ver. 10), the *imposed law*, as its

12 Since thou wast born, hast thou the morn commanded,
Or made the day spring know its place?
13 To reach the utmost limits[11] of the earth,
When from its face the wicked flee[12] dismayed?
14 Transformed[13] like clay beneath[14] the seal,
All things stand forth a fair[15] embroidered robe;
15 Whilst from the wicked is their light[16] withheld,
And broken the uplifted[17] arm.
16 To the fountains of the sea hast thou gone down?
Or walked the abysmal[18] depths?
17 The gates of death, have they been shown[19] to thee?
The realm of[20] shades, its entrance hast thou seen?
18 Or even[21] the breadth of earth hast thou surveyed?
Say, if thou knowest it[22] all.

19 The way,—where is it, to light's dwelling[23] place?
And darkness,[24] where the place of its abode?

subject. The preposition ב in בנאון may, in that case, be regarded as making it the indirect object of ישית: *puts a stop to.*

[11] Ver. 13. **Limits of the earth.** See Note xxxvii. 3.

[12] Ver. 13. **Flee dismayed.** וינערו is passive, and would be rendered, literally, *are shaken.* But ממנה (referring to the earth) can hardly mean *out of it. From it* is more literal, that is, *from its* face, or from open appearance in it. The rendering given corresponds well with the usual primary sense of נער *agitation. Scared out of it,* that is driven away to their lurking places when the light comes winging its way to the ends of the earth.

[13] Ver. 14. **Transformed.** See notes on מתהפך, xxxvii. 12, and the references thereto. Notes on נהפך xxviii. 5, and on ההפך xxx. 15.

[14] Ver. 14. **Beneath the seal.** "Its dark and apparently formless surface is changed to a world of varied beauty and magnificence; just as the shapeless clay takes the beautiful device from the seal; CONANT. See HERDER's idea that, in some sense, "every morning is a new creation."

[15] Ver. 14. **A fair embroidered robe.** To make the comparison good, by לבוש must evidently be meant a robe with figures worked upon it. CONANT, *gay apparel;* SCHLOTTMANN, *Festgewand;* DILLMANN, in mannigfaltigen Umrissen und Farben; RENAN, un riche vetement.

[16] Ver. 15. **Their light.** "According to xxiv. 17," says DELITZSCH, "the light of evil doers is the darkness of the night, which is to them, as an aid to their work, what the light of day is for other men." Compare John iii. 19: "Loved darkness more than light."

[17] Ver. 15. **Broken the uplifted arm.** Our word *frustrated* has the same figure. The picture is a very vivid one: the arm just raised to do evil arrested by the light.

[18] Ver. 16. **Abysmal depths.** חקר תהום. Lit., *the secret of the tehom,* or "great deep" mentioned Gen. i. 2; vii. 11. It is sometimes used for the sea or ocean.

[19] Ver. 17. **Been shown.** The sense of נגלו here is not that of opening (*the gate opened*) but of *revealing.*

[20] Ver. 17. **The realm of shades.** צלמות may be used figuratively of a state of sorrow, or of approach to death, as it seems to be taken Ps. xxiii. 4, but here by the usual law of parallelism, *Tzalmaveth* would mean something more remote and profound than *Maveth* (death), or farther removed from this present earthly being. In both, the imagery of gates is from the same feeling of returnlessness that gave rise to the similar language in Homer: 'Αΐδαο πύλαι, *the gates of Hades,* Il. V. 646, IX. 312.

[21] Ver. 18. **Or even the breadth of earth.** CONANT, *even to* (עד), which is, perhaps, to be preferred; since עד, here, as in some other places, denotes *degree.*

[22] Ver. 18. **Knowest it all.** It refers to all the questions asked, and not merely the breadth of the earth.

[23] Ver. 19. **Light's dwelling-place.** Well rendered by UMBREIT:

Wo geht der Weg hin zu des Lichtes Wohnung.

[24] Ver. 19. **And darkness.** It is not the same question. Darkness is spoken of as a positive quality having a source and place of its own. So Isaiah xlv. 7, יוצר אור ובורא חשך. When God speaks to men He must address them in their own language, and that must be according to their thinking, or the *conceptions* on which their words are founded. Again, if according to their conceptions, it must also be in accordance with the science to which those conceptions owe their birth. This must be done, or the language will be unintelligible, conveying neither emotion nor idea. There is no more ground of objection here, on these accounts, than there is to the recorded announcements to the Patriarchs or the Prophets, or in any other cases in which God is represented as speaking to men in human language, whether from a flaming mountain, or from a burning bush, or from a bright overshadowing cloud (νεφέλη φωτεινή) Matth. xvii. 5, or from a whirlwind, or from "a still small voice." Light, darkness, Tzalmaveth, the gates of death, the sea with its bars and doors, the araphel with its swaddling band, the Tehom or great deep, are themselves but a language, the best that could be employed, to express the great ultimate truth here intended, namely THE IMMEASURABLE UNKNOWN to which the highest human knowledge only makes an approach, ever leaving an unfathomable, which is still beyond, and still beyond, its deepest soundings. However far the phenomenal is pushed the great *ultimate facts* are as far as ever from being known. We may think we have reached the last, and given it some name that shall stand, but another addition to the magnifying power of our lenses throws this again into the region of the phenomenal, or of "the things that do appear," leaving the ultimate law, and the ultimate fact, still beyond, and so on forever and for evermore. It has been rather boldly said that the questions of these last chapters of Job would not now be asked, since science has answered most of them long ago. Science has done no such thing; and no truly scientific man would affirm it. Whatever hypothesis we adopt, whether of rays, or of undulations, light itself, in its ἀρχῆ, is invisible. It is one of "the things unseen" (Heb. xi. 3); "the way to *its house*" is not yet known. And so of other things, even the most common phenomena mentioned in this chapter have yet an unknown about them. What change takes place in the molecules or atoms of water (whether in their shape or their arrangement) when it congeals, is as unknown to us as it was to Job. We know not out of what "womb" of forces comes the ice, and the hoar frost, or the snow flake even, with its myriad mathematical diversities of congelation and crystallization. The truth is, the unknown grows faster, at every step, than the known. Every advance of the latter pushes the line farther back than it was before, and so long as the ratio of the discovered to the undiscovered is itself unknown, there is no rashness in saying that as compared with the Divine knowledge, *the real truth,* even of nature, we are as ignorant as Elihu or Job. That this is no mere railing against sci-

20 That thou should'st take it to its[25] bounds,
Or know the way that leadeth to its[26] house?
21 Thou know![27] It must be that thou then wast born,
And great the number of thy years.

22 The treasures of the snow hast thou[28] approached?
Or seen the store-house of the hail?
23 Which for the time of trouble I reserve,[29]
The day when hosts draw near[30] in battle strife.

24 Where is the way by which the lightning[31] parts?[32]
How drives[33] the rushing tempest[34] o'er the land?
25 Who made a channel for the swelling flood?
A way appointed[35] for the thunder flash?—
26 To make it rain on lands where no one dwells,
Upon the desert, uninhabited?
27 To irrigate[36] the regions wild and waste,

ence is shown by the testimony of no less a scientist than Alexander Humboldt himself. Thus he says, Kosmos, Vol. II., p. 48, in respect "to the meteorological processes which take place in the atmosphere, the formation and solution of vapor, the generation of hail, and of the rolling thunder, there are questions propounded in this portion of the book of Job which we, in the present state of our physical knowledge, may indeed be able to express in more scientific language, but scarcely to answer more satisfactorily."

[25] Ver. 20. **To its bounds.** This shows that ultimate causal knowledge is intended,—or that finishing knowledge (τὸ τέλειον as distinguished from the τὸ ἐκ μέρους, 1 Cor. xiii. 10) beyond which nothing more is to be known about it.

[26] Ver. 20. **The way that leadeth to its house.** Another mode of expressing the same idea. "*Its house*" where dwells the ἀρχή, or first principle that makes it what it is, and of which all subsequent phenomena are but different degrees of manifestation; the phenomenon last reached by scientific discovery being only called an ἀρχή till something beyond it is revealed and takes the name. These questions, as Humboldt intimates, may yet be asked, each one of them, and no mere names like "*gravity*," "force," "correlation of forces," can evade their point, or conceal our inability to answer perfectly.

[27] Ver. 21. **Thou know!** Many take this as irony. This is the way Renan gives it:

> Tu le sais sans doute! car tu étais né avant elles;
> Le nombre de tes jours est si grand!

The idea is insupportable. The voice of Jehovah is sounding loud above the roar of the tornado that bursts from the electric amber cloud; Job and all the rest most probably lying prostrate, with their faces in the dust! What a time for sarcasm, especially on such a theme, the fewness of the human years! But the translation above given, it may, perhaps, be said, comes nearly to the same thing, It is not so. The peculiar style, combined of the exclamatory and the interrogative, is to bring vividly before the mind the change that ensues in the illustrative phenomena to be now mentioned. The personal knowledge of the first mentioned great creative acts could only be claimed on the score of experience or cotemporeity, which are out of the question. Those now to be mentioned are familiar every-day phenomena, and observation, it might be thought, is sufficient for their discovery. But in these, too, there is an unfathomable depth of mystery. As no length of human days could give the one, so no keenness of observation, or of inductive analysis, could reach the other, though lying right beneath our eyes. So here ידעת, spoken abruptly and forcibly, but not with irony or contempt, is exclamatory and at the same time carries a hypothetical force: *Thou knowest!* that is, as if thou knewest, or could'st know! The second clause is only a varied and forcible mode of presenting the same thought. There is much here that reminds us of a passage in that strangely impressive apocryphal book of II. Esdras (sometimes styled the IV.): "Then said the angel unto me: go thy way; weigh me the weight of the fire, or measure me the blast of the wind, or call me again the day that is past. If I should ask thee of the springs of the Deep, or where are the outgoings of Paradise, peradventure thou would'st say, I never went down into the Deep, neither did I ever climb up into Heaven; but now have I asked thee only of the fire, and the wind, and of the day through which thou hast passed, and of things from which thou canst not be separated, and yet thou canst give me no answer. Things grown up with thee thou canst not know; how then should'st thou comprehend the way of the Highest!"

[28] Ver. 22. **Approached.** הבאת, most literal, *gone* or *come to*, *visited*, *entered into*, as בוא may be rendered without the preposition, as, באי שער עירו, Gen. xxiii. 18.

[29] Ver. 23. **I reserve.** חשכתי, see Note xxi. 30; "the wicked *reserved* to the day of doom."

[30] Ver. 23. **When hosts draw near.** This gives the etymological idea of קרב: *closeness and battle*, literally, for battle closely joined. See Deut. xx. 2, 3, בקרבכם אל מלחמה, *when ye draw nigh to battle*, or *join battle*.

[31] Ver. 24. **Lightning.** So Schlottmann אור: Das Licht ist der Blitz, as in xxxvi. 32, and he might also have said, as in xxxvii. 3, 11, 15. He finds an argument for it from its agreement with the second clause: the lightning and the storm coming with the snow and the hail. The word דרך here may refer to the direction of the lightning flash so difficult to trace (see Note on xxxvii. 4) or to the method or law of the fact, as חק (see xxviii. 26) refers to the dynamical principle. If referred to light it may be the law of its existence or origin.

[32] Ver. 24. **Parts.** Lit., *is parted;* but the Niphal may be rendered deponently or intransitively. If אור is the lightning, it presents the idea of the heavens cloven by it in all directions, or its being cloven from the cloud. Ps. xxix. 7 may be regarded as parallel to it: "the voice of the Lord (the thunder) cutteth out (*heweth out*) the flashes of fire," Rabbi Levi ben Gerson renders: "how it (the lightning) breaks from the cloud."

[33] Ver. 24. **How drives**—or *spreads.* יפיץ is taken intransitively, as in Exod. v. 12; 1 Sam. xiii. 8.

[34] Ver. 24. **The rushing tempest.** *The East wind* (קדים), the classical *Eurus* is thus used for a tempest. See Ps. xlviii. 8, the wind "that breaks the ships of Tarshish, Job xxvii. 21:" The East wind (or the storm) carries him away. See Jer. xxiii. 17; Isai. xxvii. 8; Ezek. xxvii. 26.

[35] Ver. 25. **A way appointed.** This is exactly like the second clause of xxviii. 26. There דרך is parallel to חק, *law*, *decree*, which requires something like it in the 2d clause. The *way* is not here merely space *direction*, but *method of action*.

[36] Ver. 27. **To irrigate.** To *satisfy*, does not seem to suit the context. The regions mentioned in the 1st clause, שאה ומשואה, wild and waste, are without any elements of vegetation, and rain can only water them.

As well[37] as cause to spring the budding grass.

28 Is there a father[38] to the rain?
The drops of dew, who hath begotten[39] them?
29 Out of whose womb came forth the ice?
Heaven's hoar frost, who hath[40] gendered it?
30 As by a stone[41] the streams are hid from sight,
And firmly bound[42] the faces of the deep.

31 Canst thou together bind the clustering[43] Pleiades?
Or loose Orion's bands?
32 Canst thou lead forth Mazzaroth[44] in its times,
Or guide the ways of Arctos[45] with her sons?
33 The statutes of the heavens knowest thou?
Their ruling[46] in the earth canst thou dispose?
34 To the clouds canst thou lift up thy voice,
That floods of rain may cover thee?
35 Lightnings canst thou send forth, that they should go,
And say, Behold us! Here we are?

36 Who hath put wisdom in the inward[47] parts?

[37] Ver. 27. **As well as.** There seems a contrast between the two clauses. The first is the sending of rain where no vegetation could be effected by it, as in the desert or the sea, the second where there is drought, but still something to germinate. There is no dwelling here on utilitarian ends merely, though there are such occasionally referred to; the great design seems to be to show the Divine sovereignty—God's omnipotence in making nature and her laws, just as it pleases Him.

[38] Ver. 28. **A father to the rain.** A creator to the rain; or is it the production of chance?

[39] Ver. 28. **Begotten.** The figure of *generation* is kept up in הוליד. There has been a great lack of attention to the momentous fact that so much of this language of generation, or of evolution, or production by birth (one thing coming out of another), is employed in Scripture, not only in the poetical parts such as Ps. xc. 2 (הָרִים יֻלָּדוּ—תְּחוֹלֵל אֶרֶץ), Prov. viii. 22; Ps. civ., and here in Job, but in the prose account of Gen. i.: "The *earth bringing forth*"—"the waters "*swarming with life*"—the Spirit "brooding upon them"—the "*generations* (תולדות) of the heavens and the earth." It is all so different from those ideas of mechanical or magical creation in which Mohammed indulges, and which distinguish so many pagan mythologies. It is a Divine *evolution*, through an outgoing Word, and the term should not be given up to the naturalists, who discard the idea of semination, and thereby make it an eternal, uninterfered with, self-evolving of the higher as lying hid in the lower.—in the lowest even,—from an infinite eternity.

[40] Ver. 29. **Out of whose womb?—Who hath gendered?** The same language of parturitive *generation* (תולדה) or causal growth, is here kept up. The cold ice the product of some cherishing heat, or brooding warmth, such as we can hardly separate from the idea of generation.

[41] Ver. 30. **As by a stone.** The icy covering.

[42] Ver. 30. **Firmly bound.** The Hithpahel יִת׳ כדו. Lit., *Hold fast to* each other. The idea of the flow arrested. Nothing could better express the transition from the fluid to the congealed state. It is some change in the coherence and space relations of the ultimate particles, or it may be in molecules still undiscovered, yet at immense distances from the ultimate parts. But what that change is, or what a world of mystery lies so near us, right under our hands and eyes, we know no more than Job.

[43] Ver. 31. **Clustering pleiades.** מַעֲדַנּוֹת, by metathesis for מענדת as generally received. Lit., *the clusterings of Cima* For ענד see Job xxxi. 36; Prov. vi. 2, where it is used, in connection with the same word קשר, for the graceful binding of ornaments. There is evidently a contrast of binding and loosing between the two members, but as regards our knowledge of what particular constellations are meant we are not much beyond the ancient versions. How little can be certainly known is seen in the labored commentary of DELITZSCH.

[44] Ver. 32. **Mazzaroth.** The change of the liquids ר and ל is so common and so easy that there can be but little doubt of מַזָּרוֹת here being the same as מַזָּלוֹת (*Mazzaloth*) 2 Kings xxiii. 5, where it is used for the constellations. Literally, houses (in the heavens) as the term is used in the old astrology (from the sense to *dwell*, which נזל has in Arabic). From the constellations generally it is transferred to the 12 signs of the Zodiac; though the signs in all parts of the heavens were observed for the determination of seasons.

[45] Ver. 32. **Arctos and her sons.** The Northern Bear; *her sons*, the three bright stars in the tail that seem constantly sweeping after it as this ever visible constellation circles round the pole. BOCHART (*Hierozoicon*, Vol. II., pa. 113) shows beyond all doubt that עַיִשׁ is identical with the Northern Bear as named by the Arabians, and described in a similar way as accompanied by *her* daughters. The name is feminine here, as ἄρκτος in Greek, and *ursa* in Latin. So the Greeks called this constellation, as well as the Northern Indians of our own continent. The fixing it helps to determine some of the others ever named with it, probably, in the first place, by the Phœnician sailors much before the Homeric times. Among quite a number of other places see Odyss. V. 272:

ΠΛΗΙΑΔΑΣ τ' ἐσορῶντι——
ἌΡΚΤΟΝ θ'
Ἥτ' αὐτοῦ στρεφέται, καὶ τ' ὨΡΙΩΝΑ δοκεύει.

The verb נחה has a pastoral air here; see Ps. xxiii. 3: leads them in the field of the skies as the shepherd his flock.

[46] Ver. 33. **Their ruling.** The corresponding Arabic verb שטר means *to write, to make records.* Hence it would seem to denote *signs, prescriptions*, and to suggest the idea given Gen. i. 14.

[47] Ver. 36. **Inward parts.** It is common in all languages to assign certain parts of the body as the seat of intellectual and passional movements. The Hebrew, like the Greek, has quite a number of such words—*heart, reins, bowels, etc.* The use of this word טחות, Ps. li. 8 (truth *in the inward parts*) ought to settle its meaning here as equivalent to *reins*, used as the Greeks use ἦπαρ or ἦτορ (heart or liver) for the region where dwells the deepest thought. The refe-

Or who hath given discernment to the[48] sense?
37 Who, by his wisdom, rules[49] the clouds?
Or who inclines[50] the vessels of the skies?
38 When dust becomes a molten mass,
And clods together cleave?
39 For the lioness dost thou provide the prey,
Or still the craving of her young?
40 When in their wonted lairs they lay them down,
Or in the jungle thickets lie in wait.
41 Who for the raven maketh sure its meat,
When unto God her children cry,
And wander[51] without food?

rence of טחות to outward phenomena (lightning, *etc.*) as is done by EWALD and UMBREIT, depends on far-fetched Arabic etymologies, and requires us to regard such phenomena as personified, with little or no distinct meaning after all. SCHLOTTMANN shows clearly the connection of thought: the mention of the celestial laws and their ruling in the earth suggests most naturally that greater work of God, the making and implanting the faculties that comprehend them. See Ps. xciv. 9.

[48] Ver. 36. **The sense.** The rendering given to the first clause determines the general meaning of the second, though leaving somewhat uncertain the precise meaning of שֶׂכְוִי. The Rabbins render it *a cock*, which DELITZSCH follows, although such a rendering of the word (see BOCHART, *Hieroz.* II., pp. 114, 115) breaks up the harmony of the parallelism. שכוי, which occurs only here, must correspond to טחות, but as it is not easy to determine what part of the body is meant, it is better to be governed by the etymology generally (שׂכה, as in its more frequent Syriac usage, *to see, look for, contemplate, image, etc.*), and by the other derivatives, שְׂכִיָּה, *image, picture*, Isai. ii. 16, מַשְׂכִּית *figure*, Ezek. viii. 12; Lev. xxvi. 1. As a part then of the physical system it might be rendered *the sensorium*, did not that sound too technical or philosophical. We have, therefore, simply rendered it *the sense*. This corresponds well to the distinction between חכמה and בינה which the common mind, even in the days of Job, accepts as familiarly as the most philosophical: the abstract reason, on the one hand, the *inductive* observing faculty of *experience* (ever dependent on the sense) as forming its intellectual counterpart or complement, on the other. The Hebrew, or rather the Syriac שכה (*saka, saha, sah, seh*) would seem to show an affinity (with its guttural worn out) to the German *sehen*, Gothic *sawan*, English *saw* or *see*.

[49] Ver. 37. **Rules.** Heb. ספר, *numbers, regulates.*

[50] Ver. 37. **Inclines.** Thus is the rendering of CONANT very suitable to the figure. ישכיב would mean, literally, *to cause to lie down*, hence *inclining* or turning over a vessel to empty it. The Arabic sense (pour out) is a secondary one, in which the old primary is lost. The VULGATE renders it: *quis enarrabit cœlorum rationem, et* CONCENTUM *cœli quis dormire faciet?* In the last clause *who shall make to sleep the harmony of heaven?* there seems to have been had in mind the old doctrine of the music of the spheres (see Ps. xix. 5), and נבלים to have been taken as meaning *harps*. It is a beautiful thought: who can make to sleep that everlasting harmony? but it is not in harmony with the context.

[51] Ver. 41. **And wander.** This is the literal rendering of יתעו, but it can hardly mean outward wandering or *flying about*, which would seem forbidden by the context. It may be taken to denote *wandering*, or lapse of mind, if used of rational beings; as in Isai. xxviii. 7, it is used to denote intoxication. As applied to the young ravens, it may denote their ravening appetite. But the question is: why is the raven selected for an illustration here, and in other parts of the Scriptures, as in Ps. cxlvii. 9. and by our Saviour, Luke xii. 24? It seems to have been universal in the East, as appears from HARIRI, *Seance* XIII., Vol. I., p. 151, De Sacy's Ed.: "O thou who hearest the young raven in his nest?"—abandoned in his nest, as the supposed fact is stated by the Scholiast, and for which he gives a ridiculous reason: "the young raven," he says, "when it first breaks the egg, comes forth perfectly white, on seeing which the parents flee with terror; and when this takes place, Allah sends to it the flies which fall in the nest. And so it remains for forty days, when its feathers become black, and the father and mother return to it." It is not mere helplessness. The pathos is doubtless aided by the idea of the hideousness of the bird, which appears especially in the young. Had it been the dove it might have sounded prettier to us; but there is here no mere sentimentality; no mere utilitarianism. God's "tender mercies are over all His works;" but it is also true that He "hath compassion on whom He will have compassion." The Divine sovereignty is the great lesson here taught, and our very deformities, as appears Gen. viii. 21, may draw **His** mercy.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

1 The goats that climb the rock, knowest thou their bearing time?
Or dost thou mark it, how the hinds bring[1] forth?
2 The months they fill, is this thy[2] numbering?
Their hour of travail, is it known to thee?
3 They bow themselves, their offspring cleave[3] the womb;

[1] Ver. 1. **Hinds bring forth.** Very common and near events, but all having a mystery beyond any explanation of human knowledge, past or present.

[2] Ver. 2. **Thy numbering.** CONANT gives the idea here: "Not the mere numbering, for that would be a very easy thing, but the original determination of the times." So in the second clause: It is the mystery of parturition, its regularity, its suddenness, its inexplicable pains.

[3] Ver. 3. **Cleave the womb.** Grammatically יַלְדֵיהֶן is the object of תְּפַלַּחְנָה; but it comes to the same thing whether we render the word causatively, or as above. Lit., *she makes them cleave.*

Their sorrows[4] they cast forth.
4 Strong are their young as on the plains[5] they grow,
And wander from them to return no more.

5 Who sent the wild ass free?
Or loosed the Zebra's[6] bands?
6 Whose home the desert I have made,
The salt and barren waste his haunts.
7 'Tis sport to him the city's noise;
The driver's ringing shouts, he hears them not.
8 The mountain range his pasture ground;
There roams[7] he searching every blade[8] of grass.

9 The Oryx,[9] will he be thy willing[10] slave?
Or in thy stall contented make his home?
10 As in a furrow canst thou bind his cord?
To plane[11] the valleys will he follow thee?
11 Ah, trust him! wilt thou? for his strength is great!
Or leave to him the produce of thy toil?
12 Canst thou be sure he will bring home thy seed?
Or gather it to form thy threshing floor?

13 The Ostrich[12] wing that flaps so joyously!
Is it the feathered pinion of the stork?[13]
14 Nay[14]—she it is that leaves her eggs to earth,
And warms them in the dust,
15 Forgetting that the foot may crush,—
The roaming beast may trample them.
16 Hard[15] is she to her young, as though not hers;

[4] Ver. 3. **Their sorrows.** Their sharp pangs. They are here spoken of as identified with the offspring. There is a great mystery here, whether we regard it as a moral one,—the parturition pangs of the animal as a curse from the fall of man,—or a purely physical one. Why does nature seem "to stumble here," as Cudworth says; or if she has been from eternity "selecting the best," why has she not, ages ago, reached the easier way? There is something very touching in this second clause: *Their sorrows they cast forth.* In the case of the human subject how pathetic the language of our Saviour, John xvi. 21: "A woman when she is in travail hath sorrow because her hour is come; but when she is *delivered* she no longer remembers her pain because of joy that one hath been born into the world." DELITZSCH happily compares תְּשַׁלַּחְנָה here with the ῥίψαι ὠδῖνα of ÆSCH. *Agam.* 1417, and EURIP. *Ion.* 45.

[5] Ver. 4. **The plains.** בָּר the *open field* used collectively for all abroad. Latin, *foras.*

[6] Ver. 5. **The Zebra's bands.** The tautology of E. V., is intolerable. DELITZSCH attempts to hide it under his two words *Wildesel* and *Wildling*; as UMBREIT also under *Waldesel* and *esel*. The עָרוֹד must be something different from the פֶּרֶא. There is but little authority for rendering it *zebra*, but it suits the passage (the wild horse coming after the wild ass) and almost anything is better than the tautology. The next verse may be taken as referring to the ערוד alone.

[7] Ver. 8. **Roams he searching.** The participial form is used as combining with ידרוש the verbal sense of exploration in יתור.

[8] Ver. 8. **Every blade of grass.** The Hebrew idiom in such cases makes כל distributive.

[9] Ver. 9. **The Oryx.** E. V., *unicorn.* Most commentators now make it the wild ox, noted for its fierceness.

[10] Ver. 9. **Willing slave.** The translation may be free, but it closely combines the sense of אבה and עָבַד.

[11] Ver. 10. **To plane.** שָׂדַד, rendered to *harrow;* more correctly *complanavit.* See Hos. x. 11. Hence from the allied Lamed He form שָׂדָה, *the plain, campus.*

[12] Ver. 13. **The Ostrich wing.** E. V., *The peacock.* The description that follows unmistakably points out the ostrich called here רְנָנִים, in the plural, from her sharp, ringing cries.

[13] Ver. 13. **The stork.** הסידה is the well-known name of this bird,—the *pious*, so called from the care she takes for her parents and her young, here contrasted with the ἀστοργία, or want of natural affection, in the ostrich. The אם is indirectly a denial. Instead of the construct state, *wing of the stork*, the word is taken rather as an adjective: the *stork wing.* So נֹצָה *feather, plumage*, is descriptive. It is the full, warm, thick-feathered wing of the one bird, as contrasted with the scant, featherless membrane of the other, unfitted for flying or hovering. The want of disposition, and the want of adaptation, go together. God made her so in both respects. On the Darwin or Lucretian theory, her poor flapper, which she uses so much, ought to have become a warm, well-feathered pinion ages ago.

[14] Ver. 14. **Nay.** The denial comes out more strongly in the כי which gives a reason for the contrast. And thus there is better preserved the main idea of both verses, namely, the variety of qualities displayed in the works of God. The ancient versions are very dark here. The LXX. does not pretend to translate, simply turning the Hebrew into Greek letters, νεέλασσα, ἀσίδα καὶ νεέσσα.

[15] Ver. 16. **Hard is she.** There is no difficulty with the masculine verb here (הקשיח), since the feminine is only generic.

In vain her labor since she has no fear.
17 For God hath made her mindless,[16] void of thought,
No share of knowledge hath he given her.
18 But when on high she boldly lifts[17] herself,
The horse and horseman both alike she scorns.

19 To the war-horse gavest thou his strength?
Didst thou with thunder[18] clothe his neck?
20 Or like the locust canst thou make him bound?
There is glory[19] in his nostrils—terror there.
21 He paws the plain, exulting in his might;
And thus he goes to meet the armed[20] host.
22 He mocks at fear, at panics[21] undismayed,
He turns not back in presence of the sword.
23 Against him[22] rings the quiver (of the foe),
The glittering lance and spear.
24 With rage and trembling swallows[23] he the earth;

[16] Ver. 17. **Made her mindless.** E. V.: *Deprived her of wisdom*, as though they made it from השה = השא, or השיא; Ps. lxxxix. 23, *exigit, taken away from. To make forget* (Hiph. of נשה) would imply that she once had it.

[17] Ver. 18. **Boldly lifts herself.** GESENIUS gives to מרא the sense *strinxit* (*equum flabello*). Hence it is rendered she lashes herself. There is little or no authority for this. The idea of flapping her wings had been given before. Here it is evidently something else: her high stature, or her *bold bearing*, by way of contrast, or set-off to what was said about her stupidity. The Hebrew מרה (for מרא) gives just the idea which the context seems to demand, a bold contumacious spirit. The old versions got very much the same idea, but in a different way, namely, by regarding תמריא as by metathesis for תמרים, which, however, would be a most unusual change. A striking illustration of this passage, thus regarded, is furnished by XENOPHON. *Anab.* I. 3; Στρουθὸν δὲ οὐδεὶς ἔλαβεν. πολὺ γὰρ ἐπεσπᾶτο φεύγουσα, τοῖς μὲν ποσὶ δρόμῳ, ταῖς δὲ πτέρυξιν ἄρασα ὥσπερ ἱστίῳ χρωμένη: "But no one ever caught the ostrich, for in her flight she kept constantly drawing on the pursuer, now running on foot, and again *lifting herself up with her wings spread out*, as though she had hoisted her sails." Compare the Homeric expression *Il.* II. 462, ἀγαλλόμεναι πτερύγεσσιν.

[18] Ver. 19. **With thunder.** רעמה Fem. of רעם the common word for thunder. Some render it here the flowing mane; as φόβη, supposed to come in some way from φόβος terror. Others, *dignity*, as though it were the same as ראמה. VULGATE *hinnitus, neighing*, as resembling thunder. The Hebrew רעם in its primary onomatopic sense of *fremitus, trembling, thunder*, answers very well when we keep in mind the subjective effect. When we think of the arched neck of the horse in his majestic boundings, of the quivering of the strong muscles, and of the idea of power which so naturally associates itself with these phenomena, we have something that may be called the *feeling* of thunder if not the outward *hearing*. There is hyperbole of course; but a perfectly scientific or farrier-like description of the mane, and ears, and neck, *etc.*, might fail in this subjective truthfulness all the more for its objective accuracy.

[19] Ver. 20. **Glory in his nostrils.** There seems no reason for departing here from the usual sense of the Heb. הוד, *glory, majesty*. It is the impression made by the appearance of the fierce war-horse under the excitement of the coming battle, and by the associations connected with it. Some would render it snorting (SCHLOTTMANN, DILLMANN). This is implied, but all the more impressively in the usual literal sense of the word. It seems like the emission of smoke and flame from the fierce eyes, and distended nostrils, and the foam of his quick breathings. The representation abounds in the Latin poets; as Claudian:

Ignescunt patulæ nares———

LUCRETIUS V. 1076:

Et fremitum patulis sub naribus edit ad arma.

VIRGIL GEORGICS III., 83:

———Tum si qua sonum procul arma dedere
Stare loco nescit, micat auribus, et tremit artus
Collectumque premens volvit sub naribus ignem.

ÆSCHYLUS, Sept. Theb. 60:

———ἀργηστὴς ἀφρὸς
χραίνει σταλαγμοῖς ἱππικῶν ἐκ πνευμόνων.
The brilliant foam from lungs of snorting steeds.

[20] Ver. 21. **The armed host.** נשק DELITZSCH here agrees with E. V. in his rendering *gewappneter Schaar*. So in Neh. iii. 19, נשק armor is used for armory.

[21] Ver. 22. **By panics undismayed.** יחת, thrown into consternation. A stronger word than פחד or ירא.

[22] Ver. 23. **Against him.** DELITZSCH renders, *over him*, but it is the quiver of the foe, not of his rider; as appears ver. 22, 2d clause. CONANT and E. V. are more correct. It is the rattling and splintering of lances, as in the contests of the mediæval knights, rather than of Homer's heroes who fought from chariots, not from steeds.

[23] Ver. 24. **Swallows the ground.** יגמא. Comp. הגמיאני Gen. xxiv. 17. This is the literal rendering in which all agree. The only question is, is it to be taken as actual or metaphorical? DILLMANN, DELITZSCH, and others regard it as figurative of the rapidity with which he passes over the ground, as "though he devoured it, or sucked it up." But this may be doubted. The literal view, swallowing, or biting, the ground in rage and impatience, is not at all inappropriate. The time of the description seems to be the moment of the first onset, or of some lull in the battle, just preceding, or in anticipation of, the grand charge. This corresponds well with the undoubted meaning of the second clause. The war-horse is waiting for the signal, and in his angry impatience biting the very ground, in a way, however, not to be confounded with the action described ver. 21. There may be hyperbole here, but very natural hyperbole, so natural that the reader is hardly conscious of its being hyperbole at all. The other view gives us an exceedingly forced and strained metaphor, unnatural under any circumstances, but far more so as coming in the midst of a description so vividly optical, and actual, as it may be called. The accompanying words are all out of harmony with it. Had it been said, "*by his swiftness*" he makes the earth vanish from sight, or seems to devour it, it might be more tolerable; but the words *in "trembling and rage."* are not at all in unison with such a metaphor. "Trembling and rage" denote impatience, but they have little association with the idea of swiftness of motion. There is no warrant for understanding these words of the earth, especially רגז *rage*, or *restlessness* (as used xiv. 1); and even if it could be done, there would be still less harmony with this supposed metaphor. It would demand the ideas of smoothness and imperceptibility, rather than of trembling and commotion; as when VIRGIL represents the

'Tis hard[24] to hold him in when trumpets sound.
25 At every blast he says—aha—aha.
Afar off snuffeth he the fight,
The chieftains' thunder and the shout of war.

26 From thine instruction soars aloft[25] the hawk,
And for the land of Teman spreads her wings?
27 Is it at thy command the eagle mounts,
To make his nest on high?
28 The rock his dwelling; there he builds his home,
The cliff's sharp tooth, the castle's battlement.
29 From thence his piercing[26] eye looks out for food,
And sees it from afar.
30 'Tis there his young ones suck[27] the blood,
Whilst where the slain are lying, there is he.

swiftness of Camilla as so great that her feet made no agitation in the heads of grain over which she was passing. But aside from all this, the metaphor is of that extremely far-fetched kind, that it would strike us as an odd conceit even if found in one of the most extravagant of the Arabian poets. BOCHART, the great authority for all this, and who is, indeed, the source from whence all later commentators have drawn, gives no example of its use by any Arabic *writer*, although he is generally so full, even to superfluity, in citations of the kind. He only gives it from the Lexicographer Golius, and the amount of it is, that an Arabic verb להם, in the VIII conj. אלתהם, has for one of its many senses *to swallow*, and that among its noun derivatives there is להים (*lahim*) that means a *swift horse*, because, as the Arabian Lexicographer Djeuharius says, he seems to swallow the ground. No author is cited. If such a strained metaphor were found anywhere, it could hardly be lacking in AHMED'S History of *Timour* (an extensive work, noted for its far-fetched metaphorical conceits, which form almost its entire contents) and HARIRI'S *Seances*, which are a perfect storehouse of strange similes of this kind going to the utmost limits of intelligibility. Neither this figure of the horse swallowing the ground, as denoting rapidity, nor anything like it, is found in either of them, as it is not in that most serious Arabian classic, the Koran. All, therefore, that BOCHART really gives in support of this notion, in which so many have followed him, is but the unauthorized dictum of a Lexicographer. The classical phrases *carpere campum, rapere viam*, it requires but little thought to see, are of a wholly different character. *Rapio, corripio* denote *swiftness* or *hurry* by another figure, that of *seizing* or *carrying along*, not of swallowing. And then again there is the conclusive ground that the idea of a racing or swiftly chasing horse, interferes with what is most graphic in the whole picture, and especially with the closely connected 2d clause of this verse.

[24] Ver. 24. **'Tis hard to hold him in.** This may seem like a free rendering of לא יאמין, but it may, notwithstanding, give the precise idea. E. V. and CONANT render *believeth not.* So SCHLOTTMANN: *Kaum glaubt es.* DELITZSCH, better: *und verbleibt nicht, stands not still;* UMBREIT: und hält nicht Stand. So DILLMANN. This corresponds well to the primary sense of אמן, האמין, which is *firmness*, whence comes the idea of *faith. He does not stand firm* (*he is restless*, comp רגז above). CONANT'S references to ix. 16; xxix. 12, deserve attention, but the context here makes a great difference. The rendering, *he cannot believe it*, goes too much into the horse's subjective, or his imagination, to have force when all else is so outwardly descriptive. It sounds, moreover, tame and forced: *he cannot believe it;* why not? He has heard trumpets sound often enough. The other view whilst agreeing with the clearest senses of האמין brings every thing else into harmony, besides shedding an unmistakable light on the first clause. It is in the beginning, or in an interval of the battle. The trumpets, as is usual in cavalry tactics, are giving the marshalling signals, but the time is not quite come for the signal of the grand charge. The war-horse bites the ground in his impatience, and, at every sound, it is almost impossible to hold him. An admirable classical illustration of this is one given in a previous note ([19] ver. 20) from VIRG. *Georg.* III. 83. It is cited by CONANT, and it should have led him, we think to the other view of יאמין.

[25] Ver. 26. **Soars aloft.** יאבר. *In altum enisus est—sich emporschwingen*, GESENIUS. It is a stronger and more poetical word than עוף.

[26] Ver. 29. **His piercing eye.** This rendering and the epithet are chosen as giving nothing more than the clear etymological sense of חפר. Literally, *digs, penetrates.*

[27] Ver. 30. **Suck.** יְעַלְעוּ an intensive form from לוע, for which some would read יְלַעְלְעוּ, and others לְעַלְעוּ. It is an onomatope, either way, denoting a most voracious *sucking* or *swallowing.*

CHAPTER XL.

1 And Jehovah answered[1] Job from the
whirlwind and said:

2 As censurer,[2] with the Omnipotent to strive!
Contender with Eloah! let him answer it.

3 And Job answered[3] Jehovah and said:

4 Lo I am vile,[4] what shall I answer thee?
My hand upon my mouth I lay.
5 Once have I spoken—I cannot reply—
Yea twice,[5] but I will add no more.

6 Then Jehovah answered Job out of the storm-cloud and said:

7 Now like a strong man gird thy loins;
'Tis I who ask thee; tell me what thou knowest.
8 Wilt thou annul my right?
Condemn *me* that thou may'st be justified?
9 Hast thou an arm like God?
Or canst thou thunder with a voice like Him?
10 Put on thee now thy glory and thy pride;
With majesty and beauty deck thyself.
11 Then send abroad thy o'erflowing wrath;
And look on every proud one,—bring him low.
12 Behold the lofty[6]—humble him;
Tread down the wicked in their[7] place.
13 Together hide them in the dust,—
Their faces in the darkness[8] bind;
14 Then, too, will I confess[9] to thee,
Thine own right hand can save.

15 Behold Behemoth[10] now,

[1] Ver. 1. **And Jehovah answered.** A pause seems intended here. The voice ceases for a while, but soon is it heard again from the tornado cloud in a somewhat severer strain, though immediately turning again to a tone of respect and encouragement for Job. The opening words are exclamatory, commencing with the abrupt use of the infinitive.

[2] Ver. 2. **Censurer.** יִסּוֹר was taken by the old versions, and the old commentators generally, as a verb, although of an anomalous form. GESENIUS satisfactorily shows it to be a noun of the form גִּבּוֹר, with an intensive meaning: *rebuker*, *censurer*.

[3] Ver. 3. **Answered;** as though called out in answer to the יַעֲנֶנָּה above.

[4] Ver. 4. **Lo I am vile.** קַלֹּתִי: *Levis sum; I am light*, —of small account: Lat. *vilis* in the sense of cheapness, and carrying also the idea expressed by the English word used by E. V.

[5] Ver. 5. **Yea twice.** RASHI refers this to two particular speeches of Job, ix. 22, 23 (see INT. THEISM, p. 36), but it is evidently a general formula for repeated utterance.

[6] Ver. 12. **Behold the lofty.** Compare Isaiah ii. 12. 17, and the speech of Artabanus, Herodotus vii. 10. It abounds in Orientalisms, as indeed Herodotus does in other places more than any other Greek writer.

[7] Ver. 12. **In their place.** תחתם. See Note xxxiv. 2, 6; xxxvi. 20.

[8] Ver. 13. **Darkness.** For the force of טָמוּן compare xx. 26 כל חשך טמון לצפוניו. It may mean here the deepest dungeons into which proud tyrants are sometimes thrown in God's retributive providence. Job had charged Him with giving up the world into the hands of the wicked, ix. 24.

[9] Ver. 14. **Confess to thee.** The later commentators render אודך "I will *praise* Thee." E. V., "*confess to Thee*," or profess—without the need of any preposition.

[10] Ver. 15. **Behemoth.** Most commentators have regarded this word as intensive plural of בהמה (*big ox*). This seems to suit very well a monster of the grass-feeding kind; but DELITZSCH gives excellent reasons for regarding it as a Hebraized Egyptian word *p-ehe-mau—river ox*. It should rather be called *boupotamos*, as it has no reference to a horse.

Whom I have made with thee;
Just like the peaceful ox he eateth[11] grass.
16 Behold, what might is in his loins;
The muscles of his belly,[12]—there his strength.
17 Like to a cedar[13] waveth he his tail,
Whilst woven firm the sinews of his[14] thighs.
18 His bones[15] are tubes of brass,
His limbs like iron bars.
19 Chief is he of the ways of God;
It is his Maker who brings nigh[16] His sword;
20 And yet[17] the hills his pasturage;
Whilst round him sport the species of the plain.
21 Beneath the lote trees lies he down to rest,
In covert of the reed—the (cooling) fen.
22 They weave for him his shade,
Whilst round him spread the willows of the stream.
23 Lo, the flood swells, he startles not;
Fearless although a[18] Jordan dash against his mouth.
24 It is as though he took it with his[19] eyes,
As with his nose he pierceth through the nets.

Since BOCHART'S very full discussion, there has hardly been any doubt about the animal intended here. Parts of the description following can in no way be accommodated to the elephant. The objection of its being an animal not found in the land of Uz, applies equally to both, and is of no force in either case. It was an animal not common, not often seen there, doubtless, but certainly heard of, and in this way well known as among the wonders of the adjacent Southern countries. On this account, both the river ox and the crocodile were better adapted to the design of the address from the fact of their being strange productions of neighboring lands, often heard of from the relations of travellers, and having the more interest for that very reason.

11 Ver. 15. **He eateth grass.** There is great force in thus bringing into the foreground of the picture this simple trait of the mighty animal. He is graminivorous like the ox. His simple mode of life is thus first given as furnishing the most impressive contrast with his huge size, his irresistible strength, and his immense powers of destruction should he be aroused to exert them.

12 Ver. 16. **The muscles.** The rendering *navel*, as given by E. V., and the old commentators generally, would require שֹׁרֵר or שֹׁר, as in *Cant.* vii. 3; Prov. iii. 8. The primary sense of *firmness* is quite common in the Syriac. Hence it is well rendered *muscle* or *sinew.* "The loins and the belly are mentioned because they immediately call up to our imagination, the form of the beast's huge circumference, and of the mighty pillar-like feet, the whole assuming a wonderful and almost quadrangular aspect." SCHLOTTMANN.

13 Ver. 17. **Waveth he.** It seems like an unnecessary resort to the Arabic to get a meaning for so common and so significant a verb as חפץ, especially when we consider the contrast, which is between the unyielding firmness of his huge thighs, and the flexibility of his tail, whether short or long. חפץ *to will*, here, *to move at pleasure.* It obeys the slightest volition, huge as it may be. The waving cedar, or cedar-branch, is used to indicate this. We cannot believe that stumpiness, as some make it, is in either case the point of the comparison.

14 Ver. 17. **His thighs.** This is the common Arabian sense of פחד when thus used. If that of E. V. is correct, it is probably an euphemism from the old Hebrew sense—*verenda—pudenda.*

15 Ver. 18. **Bones—limbs.** The words עצם and גרם are each commonly rendered bone; but in such a description as this they must be taken to mean things different though similar. The latter word may have been intended for the ribs or more flexible bones, or the limbs generally, as RENAN renders it:

Ses membres sont des barres de fer.

16 Ver. 19. **Brings nigh his sword.** This is the most literal rendering that can be given. According to E. V., and most of the older commentators cited in POOLE'S Synopsis, it means that God only can reach him with the sword. If it is the hippopotamus it becomes very clear. The folds of his skin are so thick that no human arm can drive the sword through them. Even the most powerful of modern shooting weapons fail unless aimed at the eye, or some known vital part: The later authorities, UMBREIT, SCHLOTTMANN, DILLMANN, *etc.*, render it: His Maker reaches to him (gives him) his sword (Behemoth's sword). The old rendering seems better for the reason above given. The absence of the pronoun and preposition, לו, or אליו, is a difficulty, but less to the old rendering than to the new. DELITZSCH endeavors to obviate this by saying that the language does not literally teach the giving (reaching) his sword to him, but creating him with it. Why then is such a common word יַגֵּשׁ used in such an uncommon way? Moreover, there is nothing about the hippopotamus that can be called a sword. There are a couple of gigantic incisors with which he reaps the grass, but they would never suggest the idea of a sword. DELITZSCH compares them to sickles (ἅρπη, *harpu* = חרב *hereb*) but there are two of them, and that would require the dual or the plural (his two swords or sickles) especially in an account so graphic as this.

17 Ver. 20. **And yet.** כי, here, is commonly rendered *for*, *denn*, *because*, as though his feeding on the hills, with other animals around him, gave a reason for his being called "*chief of the ways of God,*" ver. 19, or for what is said in the second clause, whichever meaning we attach to it. This is very unsatisfactory. It rather seems to have an adversative sense. The primary office of the particle כי is to call attention to anything. This it does by showing a *reason* or *motive*, most frequently a *reason for*, but, *oftentimes* a *reason against;* as has before been remarked. In the first case it is rendered *for*, *because*, *etc.;* in the second, *although*, *yet*, *notwithstanding.* This seems to make the best sense, and the best connection in this place. It calls attention to the peaceful nature of Behemoth, *notwithstanding* "he is chief of the ways of God," and *notwithstanding* the fact that superhuman strength alone can pierce the strong fortifications furnished by the thickness and firmness of his skin. It is a very striking picture, this immense animal peacefully feeding on grass, and the weaker species sporting beside him.

18 Ver. 23. **A Jordan.** The mention of the Jordan, although he is not a resident near it, is all the more natural and the more impressive for the reasons given at the end of Note 10, ver. 15. Your Jordan, large as you may think it to be, he would regard as of little account.

19 Ver. 24. **As though he took it with his eyes.** That is, the swelling river. The idea of irony, that common resort in difficulty, seems wholly out of place here.

The version above given is very literal; the making it comparative is warranted by the context, whilst the clue to the second clause, and to the connection, we think, is found in the idea of an intended contrast between *nose* and *eyes*. He calmly *looks* at the swelling river without being startled. He takes it all in his eye. It is certainly an easier and more natural metaphor than the swallowing the ground metaphorically by the war-horse xxxix. 24. Just so his huge *rooting* proboscis disdains every species of snare. As the irony breaks up all connection between vers. 23 and 24, so the other view of his easy capture is not only at war with facts, but seems to belittle the whole of the preceding description.

Chapter XLI.

1 With a hook canst thou draw out Leviathan,
Or with a line thou lettest down, his[1] tongue?
2 A rush branch through his nostrils canst thou place?
Or with the thorny spine bore through his nose?
3 Will he make many prayers to thee?
Or will he say soft things to thee?
4 Or with thee make a covenant,
That thou should'st take him for thy slave forever?
5 Wilt thou disport with him as with a bird?
Or bind him (as a plaything) for thy maidens
6 The caravans,[2] will they make trade for him?
And then retail[3] him to the[4] Canaanites?
7 With barbed irons canst thou fill his skin?
His head with fishing[5] spears?
8 Upon him lay thy hand;
Think of the battle—do no more.
9 Behold the hope (of taking him) is vain;
Yea at the very sight is one cast down.
10 There is none so desperate to stir[6] him up;
Before Me then (his[7] Maker) who shall stand?
11 Who hath first given, that I should him repay?
Since every thing beneath the heavens is mine?

12 But I must not in silence[8] pass his limbs,

[1] Ver. 1. **His tongue.** Schlottmann makes לשון the object of תשקיע: "press down his tongue with a cord." So Umbreit. Delitzsch: "sink his tongue into the line." Our E. V. is clearer and more grammatical in making לשון the object of משך the verb in the first clause, and taking בחבל as בחכה. The verb תשקיע would then be used relatively: which thou sinkest; thus keeping its usual sense as in Ezek. xxxii. 14. The other rendering would refer to the tongue after he is drawn out, but that does not agree with תשקיע, which means to sink in the water. It is the thick tongue of the crocodile, into which the hook (חַכָּה *hakka*) would most readily fasten itself, should he attempt to swallow the bait.

[2] Ver. 6. **The caravans.** The modern idea of guilds, or partnerships, has no place here. The sense used for כרה is the true one as found in Deut. ii. 6; Hos. iii. 2, and in the frequent Arabic use of the IIId conjugation.

[3] Ver. 6. **Retail.** Hebrew יחצוהו, *cut him up*—divide him into smaller portions.

[4] Ver. 6. **The Canaanites.** So Delitzsch, Ewald, Schlottmann. There is no reason for departing from the usual sense. The passage reminds us of the caravans, which, in Joseph's time, went down to Egypt (Gen. xliii. 11) with various commodities, in return for which they carried back to the people products of Egypt, among which, most probably, were fish from the Nile. It is an evidence of the antiquity of the book, unless there is interposed the objection, which grows weaker the more it is studied, that the writer cunningly adapts everything to the patriarchal times, without ever forgetting himself, or failing in any part of his picture.

[5] Ver. 7. **Fishing spears.** צִלְצַל דָּגִים, so called from their sharp ringing or whizzing sounds.

[6] Ver. 10. **None so desperate.** אַכְזָר and אַכְזָרִי *fierce, reckless, cruel, atrox*. See Prov. v. 9; xvii. 11; Isaiah xiii. 9; Jerem. xxx. 14; Lam. iv. 3; Deut. xxxii. 33; Job xxx. 21. Its use here, in connection with the word יעורנו, affords a satisfactory explanation of the phrase עֹרֵר לִוְיָתָן *to rouse Leviathan* (ch. iii. 8) as the translator has rendered it in that passage: *ready to rouse Leviathan*; most desperate or despairing men. With such an exegesis, furnished by the book itself, and in the very words, it seems unnecessary to resort to that far-fetched idea of some later commentators, namely, the anti-hebraic and anti-patriarchal notion of "enchanters who rouse up the dragon to swallow the sun in an eclipse."

[7] Ver. 10. **(His Maker.)** The transition is so sudden that the words in brackets do no more than give its force.

[8] Ver. 12. **In silence pass**; or be silent about. Delitzsch, although giving this rendering, seems to admit that it is tame. It will seem so unless we keep in mind the con-

His strength, his well-proportioned[9] build.

13 His coat of mail,[10] who hath revealed its front?
The doubling of his jaws,[11] who enters there?
14 The doors that shut his face, who opens them?
The circuits of his teeth—how[12] terrible!
15 'Tis a proud sight,[13] the grooves that form his shield;
Each one a seal, shut close and firmly bound.
16 So near do they to one another join,
The very wind between them cannot pass.
17 Each to his fellow cleaves;
Firmly they hold; there is no parting them.

18 His sneezings[14] sparkle with the light;
His eyes are like the eyelids of the dawn.
19 Forth from his mouth go burning[15] lamps,
And sparks of fire set[16] free.
20 Out of his nostrils goeth forth a smoke;
As from a caldron blown, or seething[17] pot.
21 His breath enkindleth coals;
A tongue[18] of flame seems issuing from his mouth.

nection of thought. The anthropopathisms of the passage do not, as we have seen, at all detract from the idea of a Divine speaker. The two preceding verses contained an exclamation, as though God, speaking *more humano*, makes a sudden application of what had been said, turning, as it were, for a moment, from this mighty work of His to recall the hearer to a remembrance of his own infinitely greater power. This most briefly done, he resumes again the description, coming back to it as to something that might have been passed over: "I must not omit:" "I must not keep silence about."

[9] Ver. 12. **His well-proportioned build.** The reading contains both ideas about which commentators slightly vary, whether it be הִין a measure, or חֵן = חִין, *grace, beauty*. Both may be regarded as belonging to the word in either, though one is predominant in each. עֵרֶךְ; *array, fitness* of arrangement. Hence order, proportion. The crocodile is not beautiful strictly, but there is something very regular in his build.

[10] Ver. 13. **His coat of mail.** לְבוּשׁוֹ, his thick scaly hide, and especially the front of it, or that strong part of it which covers his face and teeth.

[11] Ver. 13. **The doubling of his jaw.** Heb. רֶסֶן primarily a bit or bridle, here put for the jaw or jaws in which it is inserted.

[12] Ver. 14. **How terrible!** RENAN:

Antour de ses dents habite la terreur.

[13] Ver. 15. **'Tis a proud sight.** גַּאֲוָה. Lit., *pride, glory*. The reference is to the curious contexture of his scales.

[14] Ver. 18. **His sneezings.** It more properly means his *water spoutings*, which sparkle in the light of the sun, especially in the early morning to which the second clause refers. See ch. iii. 19. See SCHLOTTMANN'S reference to Aristotle.

[15] Ver. 19. **Burning lamps.** The translation of E. V., the most literal, and better corresponding to the appearance than flames or sparks. SCHLOTTMANN, *Fackel*. The glistening bubbles on the water. There is hyperbole, indeed, but truthful hyperbole, because just what such phenomena would suggest.

[16] Ver. 19. **Set free.** יִתְמַלָּטוּ, *make their escape*.

[17] Ver. 20. **Seething pot.** E. V.; though applied to דוּד. Dr. CONANT renders אַגְמוֹן *reeds* (a kettle with kindled reeds). The construction seems against it. אַגְמוֹן has the appearance here of the name of some vessel like דוּד, although the other sense has more examples. The primary idea of אגם is *fermentation, heat, boiling*. Hence comes אֲגַם *warm, stagnant* water, full of air bubbles, probably—*palus, marsh*. Thence the name for that which grows in such damp places, the *reed* or *flag*, very ill adapted to making a fire of. Hence the sense of a *boiling vessel* derived directly from the primary idea. It is an example of the variety of verbal branches that may grow from one root.

[18] Ver. 21. **A tongue of flame.** לַהַב does not of itself mean fire; but rather a splendor in the shape of a tongue or prolonged stream flickering and waving like a licking tongue. Hence the classical figure *lambens flamma*. We need not trouble ourselves about the scientific accuracy of this description; neither on that account are we to discard it as hyperbolical, or unworthy of a Divine address. God should talk scientifically, that is, accurately, it is said, if He speaks at all. But when will scientific language be settled so as to be never unsettled? Besides, this is emotional language, a Divine painting, as we have said, wholly descriptive so as to produce a subjective or emotional effect. It is addressed to the feeling as the most truthful part of our nature. Such is this emotional state which the very sight of the animal, especially in some peculiar positions, produces in the mind. It was this which gave rise to the description of ACHILLES TATIUS as cited by SCHLOTTMANN: μυκτὴρ ἐπὶ μέγα κεχηνώς, καὶ πνέων πνρώδη καπνὸν ὡς ἀπὸ πηγῆς πυρός: "a nostril gaping to an immense extent, and breathing out a flaming smoke as from a fountain of fire." Travellers who mean to be strictly truthful are often under this influence, and their wonderful descriptions thus produced, are sometimes nearer to the life, in the sense mentioned, than the most statistical accounts. Let any one compare, for example, the present picture of the animal with the most scientific record of the creature, presented with an idealess accuracy in their scientific technics: "Crocodile, *genus saurianum, reptile; cauda elongata, etc.*; or to put it into Latin English: "the vertebræ concave anteriorly, convex posteriorly, having intercalated processes, the lower jaw longer than the cranium—the condyles of the temporal bones corresponding to ossa quadrata placed behind the articulation of the head," *etc., etc.* All well enough as minutes or memorial measurements of the creature, and very useful in their way. But then let the reader of such an account see a real live crocodile just rising out of the depths, as described by a traveller whom SCHLOTTMANN quotes: Ein dicker Rauch strömte aus seinen weitgeöfneten Nasenlöchern mit einem Geräusche welches beinahe die Erde erschütterte: A thick smoke streamed out of his wide-opened nostril holes, with a roaring which almost made the earth to tremble." Or let him compare it with the impression,—the truthful impression we mean,—made by this sublime description in the

22 Strength dwelleth ever in his neck;
Before him (as a courier) terror[19] runs;
23 His fleshy folds, how firmly do they cleave!
Hard bound upon him—all immovable.
24 His heart is molten as a stone;
Yea, like the nether millstone petrified.

25 Whene'er he rises up the mighty are afraid;
In breaking terrors go they all astray.
26 Though one may reach[20] him with the sword, it holdeth not;
Nor spear avails, nor dart, nor coat of mail.
27 The iron he esteems as straw,
And brass as brittle wood.
28 The archer cannot make him flee;
Sling-stones are turned[21] to chaff.
29 Like stubble are they held,[22] the ponderous mace,
The shaking of the spear—he laughs at all.

30 Sharp pointed shards[23] beneath him lie;
A threshing drag he spreads upon the mire.
31 Like a caldron causes he the deep to foam,
Or like an ointment pot, the[24] Nile.
32 Behind he makes a sparkling path to shine;
One takes the water flood for hoary hair.
33 On earth there is none to be compared with him,
Created without fear.
34 On all high things[25] he looketh (fearlessly),
Himself the king o'er all the sons[26] of pride.

Book of Job. It would at once decide the question of the higher, that is, the emotional truthfulness. And here the remark has place that in speaking of anthropopathic language we are to avoid the idea of any *pretense*, or *mere accommodation* on the part of God, as of a parent to children in a childish way, or of a wise man condescending to the use of incorrect language to the ignorant. No, it is the Infinite coming really down into the finite sphere, as He must be able to do if He is truly Infinite and "can do all things." It is the parent, not talking *childish* simply, but really *becoming* the child, for the moment, and so speaking in *his own*, as he speaks in the child's vernacular. Can we have any difficulty here, after knowing that the Infinite Word became flesh, and took our human tabernacle, and in all things *felt* and *spoke*, earnestly and sincerely, as we *feel* and *speak*, yet never, for a moment, parting from His eternal and essential Deity?

[19] Ver. 22. **Terror runs.** Not the terror of the fugitive merely, but Terror personified as the *avant coureur* of the mighty beast, running joyfully, or dancing before him. In some versions רוץ may have been taken for דוץ. But though the latter word only occurs once, its significance would be most plain, were it not so clear in the Syriac and the Arabic. דְּאָבָה is the extreme terror that produces faintness. RENAN's rendering is very vivid:

Devant lui bondit la terreur.

[20] Ver. 26. **May reach him.** The verb הַשִּׂיג in its sense *attigit*, *assecutus est*, *reached*, *come nigh to*, closely resembles הִגִּישׁ xl. 19; and the similarity of the expressions strongly confirms the view taken there.

[21] Ver. 28. **Are turned.** נֶהְפְּכוּ; see Note xxviii. 5.

[22] Ver. 29. **Like stubble are they held.** נֶחְשְׁבוּ. This plural verb seems to have תותח alone for its subject, but it belongs as well to כִּידוֹן that follows.

[23] Ver. 30. **Sharp pointed shards,** חַדּוּדֵי חָרֶשׂ, sharp points of broken potsherds, like that mentioned ii. 8, which "Job took to scrape himself with,"—a number of times used in Scripture to express fragmentary or broken things. But does it mean any parts of the animal, as some think: the under or belly scales that leave their mark upon the miry bed of the river, (as though a thrashing drag had been drawn over it) or rather sharp things below him at the bottom of the river? DELITZSCH favors the former idea, together with CONANT and SCHLOTTMANN. The translator follows them, though there are strong objections. The belly scales are not hard nor sharp.

[24] Ver. 31. **The Nile.** It is called ים or the sea by the Arabians, or Al-bahar as it is at this day denoted. For ים thus used, see KOR. Surat xx. 39.

[25] Ver. 34. **Everything exalted:** Every animal that seems to tower above it, or every proud assailant who thinks him an easy capture.

[26] Ver. 34. **The sons of pride.** The proudest of the wild beasts. He attacks Behemoth himself. שחץ, however, is used as descriptive of any very fierce wild beast of the wilderness or of the desert. See xxviii. 8. VULGATE: *filios superbiæ*.

Chapter XLII.

1 Then Job answered Jehovah, and said:

2 I know it now, all things[1] are in Thy power,
No thought of Thine can ever be withstayed.
3 "Who is this[2] that without knowledge counsel hides?"
'Tis I then[3] who have spoken foolishly;
Wonders too great for me, that I knew not.
4 But hear, O hear me now,[4] and let me speak again.
"Tis I who ask" (thou saidst[5] it) "let me know."
5 By the ear's hearing[6] have I heard of thee;
But now mine eyes behold.
6 This, then,[7] (mine only[8] word): I loathe me,[9] I repent,
In dust and ashes.

7 And it was so that after the Lord had spoken these words unto Job, the Lord
said to Eliphaz the Temanite: "My wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy
two friends; because ye have not spoken unto[10] me the thing that is firm,[11] as my
servant Job hath.
8 Now then take unto you seven bullocks and seven rams, and go unto my ser-
vant Job, and offer up a burnt offering for you. But[12] his face will I accept, that I
may not deal with you after your folly; for ye have not spoken unto me the right
thing, as my servant Job.

[1] Ver. 2. **All things are in thy power.** If we wonld know the aim of this address, or the question it answers, and on which commentators have so differed, we have the solution here in the very words of Job. His submission reveals the design of this wondrous display of power. Job certainly did not miss the point; for the whole object, (unless, as Merx does, we suppose the whole dramatic plan to be a failure) was to convince him of it. And he is convinced. He sees it as he never saw it before: Omnipotence not to be doubted or distrusted from suspicion of any *fatality* in things, or absolute sovereignty never to be called in question. See more fully on this in the Introduction on the Theism of the book, pp. 21–25, and 40, 41.

[2] Ver. 3 **Who is this?** As though the words struck him in a new light.

[3] Ver. 3. **'Tis I then.** He repeats the words of the Almighty as though he saw a force in them he never saw before, and makes a personal application of them to himself in a way not expressed, or inadequately expressed, at their former utterance. Now he confesses that, whatever reference they may have had to Elihu or to others, they certainly include himself. He is the man who has talked so wildly. He says nothing, thinks nothing, of others. He is alone in the presence of God whose appearance he had invoked. See Remarks in Note on xxxviii. 2, and Int. Theism, p. 26.

[4] Ver. 4. **O hear me now.** Intensive force of נא, the particle of entreaty. He had twice said he would add no more, xxxi. 40; xl. 5; but now he asks for a single word, and to enforce it, repeats the words of the Almighty in the 2d clause.

[5] Ver. 4. (**Thou saidst it.**) The feeling of the dramatic action might be enough, but these words in brackets simply give the meaning which the unimpassioned reader might mistake. As he had before done, ver. 3, so here Job repeats to himself the language of xxxviii. 3 (2d clause) in the very words as they were uttered by God. It is the ground of *the one declaration* he wishes to make. So Renan.

[6] Ver. 5. **By the ear's hearing.** A traditional knowledge, a traditional theism. Now it is something far deeper, and clearer, whether an actual visual sight of some Divine glory, or something so described, as being as much greater than former knowledge as the sense of the eye excels that of the ear.

[7] Ver. 6. **This then.** עַל כֵּן must refer to this one thing he wishes to say. "It is on this account I asked Thee to hear me as Thou hast given me permission." *Propterea.* For this one word. What is in brackets simply indicates the emphasis of the appeal. This is shown by the difficulty of giving עַל כֵּן any strictly logical meaning here.

[8] Ver. 6. (**Mine only word.**) Belonging to the emphasis.

[9] Ver. 6. **I loathe me.** The verb מאס is often used without an object, as it is here, and there is no reason why it is not to be supposed to be a personal as well as an impersonal object that is understood. The rendering, *I loathe*, or *I reject it*, that is, *my argument*, comes to the same thing.

[10] Ver. 7. **Spoken unto me.** E. V., and most others, ancient and modern, render it spoken, *de me*, or *concerning* me; LXX. ἐνώπιόν μου; Vulgate, coram me. Aben Ezra maintains that it "pertains solely to the confession which Job had made unto God and the others had not;" and hence he would translate it, *to me*. The difference is important, and for the reason of adopting here for אֵלַי the sense which is, indeed, the more usual and almost universal one, see the Introduction on the Theism of the book, page 35. The view there taken, however, might be maintained, even if we give to אל the less common sense of *de*, or *concerning*.

[11] Ver. 7. **The thing that is firm.** See also the Int. Theism, page 36. נְכוֹנָה, primary sense *firmness*, *stability*, *that which will stand*, just the thing that ought to be said. The whole aspect of the context gives the idea of some single right saying in distinction from an extended argument.

[12] Ver. 8. **But his face will I accept.** E. V., "*For* his face." The particle is כִּי אִם, commonly rendered *but*, and Conant seems right in saying that it refers to the implication in the preceding clause, namely, that *their* prayer would not be accepted.

9 Then went Eliphaz the Temanite, and Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite, and did as the Lord had spoken unto them, and the Lord accepted the face[13] of Job.

10 And the Lord turned the captivity of Job when he prayed[14] for his friends. And the Lord increased all that Job had, twofold.

11 Then there came unto him all his brethren and all his sisters, and all that had been of his acquaintance before, and they did eat bread with him in his house, and they mourned with him, and comforted him for all the evil that the Lord had brought upon him; every man also gave him a piece of money, and every one a ring of gold.

12 So the Lord blessed the latter end of Job more than his beginning; for he had fourteen thousand sheep, and six thousand camels, and a thousand yoke of oxen, and a thousand she asses.

13 He had also seven sons and three daughters.

14 And he called the name of the first Jemima, and the name of the second, Kezia, and the name of the third Keren-happuch.

15 And in all the land were no women found so fair as the daughters of Job; and their father gave them an inheritance among their brethren.

16 And Job lived after this[15] a hundred and forty years, and saw his sons, and his sons' sons, even four generations.

17 So Job died old and full of years.

13 Ver. 9. **The face of Job.** To *lift up* the face is something more than mere acceptance. It denotes *grace*, *favor*.

14 Ver. 10. **Prayed for his friends.** Job was a priest after the order of Melchizedeck, and so a type of the Great High Priest who forgave his sins, and "bore his infirmities, and carried all his sicknesses."

15 Ver. 16. **Lived after this.** This does not necessarily mean, *in addition to this.* Such language may denote that he *lived on*, after this, until he reached the age of a hundred and forty years, making his years seven less than the number of Jacob's. There is no one of the patriarchs who lived as long as the other reckoning would make him,—at the least two hundred years. If, therefore, it was the invention of "the poet," the "first poet," or the "second," or even the third ("the Doppelgänger of the first," as DELITZSCH strangely intimates) he would hardly have placed him so far back. Moreover, "sons and sons of sons, four generations," would be rather moderate for a longevity so great as this reckoning would make.

9 Then went Eliphaz the Temanite, and Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite, and did as the Lord had spoken unto them; and the Lord accepted the face of Job.

10 And the Lord turned the captivity of Job when he prayed for his friends; also the Lord increased all that Job had twofold.

11 Then there came unto him all his brethren and all his sisters, and all they that had been of his acquaintance before, and they did eat bread with him in his house; and they mourned with him, and comforted him for all the evil that the Lord had brought upon him; every man also gave him a piece of money, and every one a ring of gold.

12 So the Lord blessed the latter end of Job more than his beginning; for he had fourteen thousand sheep, and six thousand camels, and a thousand yoke of oxen, and a thousand she asses.

13 He had also seven sons and three daughters.

14 And he called the name of the first Jemima; and the name of the second, Kezia; and the name of the third, Keren-happuch.

15 And in all the land were no women found so fair as the daughters of Job; and their father gave them an inheritance among their brethren.

16 And Job lived after this a hundred and forty years, and saw his sons, and his sons' sons, even four generations.

17 So Job died old and full of years.

¶ Ver. 9. **The face of Job.** [illegible]

¶ Ver. 10. **Prayed for his Friends.** [illegible]

¶ Ver. 16. **Lived after this.** [illegible]

[illegible]

ADDENDA.

EXCURSUS I.

CHAP. XIX. 25–27.

I KNOW THAT MY REDEEMER LIVES;
AND O'ER MY DUST, SURVIVOR, SHALL HE STAND.
MY SKIN ALL GONE, THIS [REMNANT] THEY MAY REND,
BUT FROM MY FLESH SHALL I ELOAH SEE;
SHALL SEE HIM MINE;——
MINE EYES SHALL SEE HIM—STRANGER NOW NO MORE.

IF this passage were taken by itself, it might be entitled, "A PSALM OF JOB, the Suffering and the Tempted Man of God." It might have for its prefatory motto הִגָּיוֹן, a rapturous Meditation, or an Ecstatic Burst of Joy, at the thought of seeing his Redeemer, his once seemingly alien, but now reconciled, God. There is something in it which suggests the glorious language at the close of the 16th Psalm:

> Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades;
> Thou wilt not suffer thy Beloved to see corruption.
> Thou wilt make me know the *way of life;*
> Fulness of joys in thy presence,
> Glories at Thy right hand forever more.

That Psalm is entitled מִכְתָּם, which the LXX. have well rendered *στηλογραφία*, a monumental engraving, or *pillar writing*, from the Hebrew כתם, *to cut in, engrave*—not for מכתב, as some think, but an independent root, wrongly rendered *maculatus* by GESENIUS, Jerem. ii. 22. It is rather, "*indelibly cut in*," or deeply *marked*, as E. V. has it—the Syriac sense being wholly a secondary one, and the name for gold, כֶּתֶם, coming from the idea of *coining* or *stamping*. The application of these words to Christ by the Apostle Peter would warrant us in styling it the Saviour's monumental inscription, to be placed on the holy sepulchre, if its site were really known. The internal evidence warrants us in regarding these memorable words of Job in a similar light, whilst the language prefacing it, vers. 23, 24, leaves no doubt of its appropriate monumental character, whether used for the Redeemer or the redeemed. The conjunction ו would not militate against this, since it merely shows a connection as it stands, but becoming redundant when the passage is taken separately, like the Greek ὅτι left untranslated in New Testament quotations.

The passage has ever been regarded as a most remarkable one. In order to its right interpretation, the first thing is to determine the points that are perfectly clear. They will give us the meaning of the rest, and of the whole. The ideas which admit of no doubt may be thus stated: 1. Job's feeling—after a season of great despondency—that he had something most important to announce (vers. 23, 24). An idea has somehow suddenly sprung up in his mind, which he wishes so engraved, so cut in the rock, that it may never be lost. It is something for the world to know. This alone is sufficient to show that it is more than a hope of getting back again his sheep and camels, as some of the lowest Rationalists regard it. 2. There is One whom he calls his Goel, avenger or redeemer, who will be the power of his deliverance. This Redeemer is described as אַחֲרוֹן, *one after him*, who is to stand, עַל עָפָר, *over dust*, whether it means *his dust*, or dust generally, as a name for earth, or for the dead,

as is the case in other passages (see שֹׁכְנֵי עָפָר, *dwellers in dust,* Isaiah xxvi. 19; also Ps. xxii. 30; Gen. iii. 19; Ps. civ. 29, *et al.*). 3. There is a clear allusion to his body, his skin, and something remaining after his skin, which is to be destroyed without destroying *him.* 4. He is to see God. Language cannot be clearer than that by which this is expressed. Two distinct verbs of sight are used, and the declaration is made three times in the most emphatic manner. 5. He is to see God reconciled, no more a stranger, זר, or an enemy, צר (as he seems to describe him, or some hostile power that God permits, xvi. 9). The view entertained by GESENIUS, UMBREIT, VAIHINGER, STICKEL, HAHN and VON HOFFMANN (as above), and that of SCHLOTTMANN and DELITZSCH, referring זר to Job, come, in this respect, to the same thing. 6. There is unmistakable language expressing an ecstatic rapture at the thought conceived, and an ardent longing for its fulfilment.

So far the passage is clear. Now, for particular words. גֹּאֵל, ver. 25. All render this word *Redeemer.* But the Scripture uses it in two ways. The oldest sense of גֹּאֵל, the *Avenger of blood,* comes directly from the primary meaning *to be stained,* stained with blood. In this sense, the גֹּאֵל is the *next of kin* (Nachmann), stained with the blood of the murdered man until he avenges him by slaying his murderer. This is the idea on what may be called the criminal side of the ancient jurisprudence. Thence it passes to the civil. Here the Goel, the *Nachmann,* the next of kin, is the one who buys back (*redeems*) the lost inheritance. The other is the older usage, and it seems the more strange, therefore, that OLSHAUSEN, as quoted by CONANT, should say so positively: "Der Bluträcher gehört in keiner weise hieher." On the contrary, everything points to this idea. Job regards himself as one murdered by a cruel enemy, and the prologue, whether we accept it historically or dramatically, confirms it in the strictest sense. Satan was his murderer, and the Goel is the great Redeemer promised Gen. iii. 15, and of whom, as the human Avenger and Deliverer (the θεάνθρωπος, a divine kinsman), some trace is preserved in all mythologies, besides appearing so prominently in the Prophets as the אֵל גִּבּוֹר, the Militant or Hero Messiah. The presence of the avenging idea in his mind is shown by the language, xvi. 18: *O Earth, cover not thou my blood* (see note on that passage). And so, too, in regard to the word אַחֲרוֹן; if a Hebrew term were to be invented to express Nachmann, no one would be more appropriate to it than this. For the best interpretation of עַל עָפָר see DELITZSCH. The pronoun being omitted does not weaken the view. Its absence allows us to regard it as spoken of the human dust generally, all the dead, although Job must have had primary reference to himself. Ch. xli. 25 shows that the phrase may be taken of the earth, generally, as *place,* if the context demands it; but here, where Job is speaking of his decaying and already decomposing body, everything points to that mournful sense of *dust* which is first found in Gen. iii. 19, as denoting *that* out of which man was formed, and to which he returns. From this it pervades the scriptural language, and becomes a name for the material of the human body, even before death: "*who am but dust and ashes.*" The difficulty in regard to נִקְּפוּ, a strong Piel verb, denoting sharp *cutting* or *biting,* comes from overlooking the principle mentioned in the note to vii. 3, and the illustrations there furnished from Job iv. 19; xviii. 18; xxxiv. 20; Ps. xlix. 15; Luke xii. 20, and other places. The same reason prevails here. The agent is something fearful or loathsome, causing aversion to the very mentioning of the name. Our E. V. and the earlier translations took the right general view, whatever may have been their applications. The agent here is most probably *worms.* It may be that Job thought of the worms destroying his flesh in the grave; but that is not as likely as the reference to the worms then crawling on his diseased body, and of which he speaks vii. 5. They must have been a source of great torment as well as of loathing, and their being something in open sight would account, along with the other reason, for his not naming them, except by the implied pronoun. There may have been a gesture (δεικτικῶς); but there is hardly need of the supposition, either in regard to the biting worms or the wretched fragment of a body. In the case of such objects, the eyes interpreted everything, and the fewest words were the most impressive. *They* and *this* are all that is needed.

After my skin. This denotes the more interior and vital parts of the body until it is all

sore and corroded. The view gives force to SCHLOTTMANN'S argument, that מִבְּשָׂרִי means "*without his flesh*," supposed to be all gone in consequence of the process previously imagined. It was thought best to render מִבְּשָׂרִי in the most literal manner, *from my flesh;* since the translator found it difficult to decide, with certainty, which of the views taken of מ is the right one (*from* as a *position*, or from as meaning *without*), and therefore left it in English with the same ambiguity it has in the Hebrew. The weight of evidence, however, is on the side of a total disembodiment. And here it may be remarked, that the true force of the passage, as testimony, would seem actually weakened by overstraining it into a dogmatic teaching or anticipation of the New Testament doctrine of the resurrection. This would involve the idea of an outward supernatural revelation, made directly by an outward divine influence upon the mind; for Job could not have thought it otherwise. The other supposes it an idea brought out of him in his extreme anguish, his experience of the vanishing body with the soul yet vigorous, and his strong yearning after the reconciled presence of God. It is such a sudden flashing up of hope as might be believed to come from such a state. The Scripture has also more power for us in this way, when we feel its revelations to be thus brought out of the depths of the soul—revelations all the more divine by being thus, in God's providence, pressed out of the human, than if they had been outwardly and mechanically given as dogmatic truths.

Shall see him mine; לִי, *for me*, on my side; *a stranger now no more;* לֹא זָר, or *estranged;* or as he might have said, לא צר, *no longer an enemy*, as he seemed to be xvi. 9. For the interpretation of כלו כליותי בחקי, there can be nothing happier than that of EWALD, whose rationalizing might be almost forgiven him for the spiritual insight and enthusiastic feeling he manifests in his description of the state of soul these words express: So dass er endlich im höchsten Entzücken wie vergehend ausruft, *O ich vergehe* fast vor freudigem Beben und höchster Sehnsucht! "So that finally in the highest rapture, like one wholly overcome, he cries out: 'O I faint, I am almost gone, from joyous emotion and the high intensity of desire.'" (See INTRODUCTION THEISM, pa. 8, where this passage is more fully treated in connection with Ch. xiv. 14.) That the full rendering given to that impressive word כלו by the translator, is not beyond its fair significance, will appear from its use Ps. lxxxiv. 3: "Longs my soul, *faints* my soul (כלתה),—"my heart and my flesh cry out, O living God, for thee." So Ps. lxiii. 2: "Thirsts for thee my soul—longs for thee my flesh—so to see thy glory, as I have seen thee in the sanctuary." Compare also Ps. cxix. 81: "*Faints* my soul for thy salvation" (כלתה נפשי). And here it may be well to note what it was for which Job so longed. It goes not only beyond the common worldly good, but also what might be esteemed a high religious aspiration. It is not the recovery of his lost oxen and camels, as observed before; it was not the restoration of his family joys, though he speaks so feelingly (xvi. 7) of his "desolated household;" it is not the thought of living again merely in another existence; it is not the bliss of that Vedaic Paradise of flowers and sunshine which MERX describes as so surpassing the darker Shemitic conceptions (see INT. THEISM, pa. 16). The intense desire which makes him faint away is for *reconciliation* with God, to behold him as a friend, a stranger now no more, as one "whose favor is life, whose loving-kindness is more than life." This was the Hebrew and Patriarchal piety which we now think so far behind our own. It appears, as has been said (INT. THEISM, pa. 5), even in their despondency when the thought of death as the close of their being had its most mournful aspect in the idea of bidding farewell to God: "I said, I shall no more see Jah, Jah (Jehovah the Lord), in the land of the living," or among the living; HEZEKIAH'S *Prayer*, Isaiah xxxviii. 11. At other times it is the soul consoling itself with the idea of God surviving. In this very passage, חי would of itself express this, but the context demands it. It is not that the Redeemer lives merely, or is alive, but that he lives after Job, to stand over and watch his sacred dust. This is an idea prominent in that most expressive paraphrase of Watts which some would depise as uncritical and incorrect. It is a question of subordinate importance whether in this passage of Job there is taught dogmatically the doctrine of the resurrection of the body as held in our Christian articles, or whether there is only the thought of a spirit-

ual beholding of the divine presence. "The power of an endless life" (see INT. THEISM, pa. 4), a true resurrection power, is in it; and we may, therefore, regard the spirit of the words as expressed in those lines of the unpretending hymnist that may be found engraved, as Job wished it engraved, in so many of our rural burying-grounds:

God my Redeemer ever lives,
And often from the skies,
Looks down and watches o'er my dust,
Till He shall bid it rise.

Though greedy worms devour my skin,
And gnaw my wasting flesh,
Yet He will build my bones again,
And clothe them all afresh.

Then shall I *see* my Saviour's face,
With strong immortal eyes,
And feast upon his unknown grace,
With rapture and surprise.

Watts' "*strong immortal eyes*" is a happy attempt to give the force of Job's thrice-repeated *beholding;* whilst the "rapture and surprise" are justified by the expressive Hebrew words he had employed, כלו כליותי בחקי: "My reins faint in my bosom."

This was a turning point in Job's experience. He is never afterwards, as SANCTIUS remarks, exactly the man he was before, or in the preceding parts of this discussion. He never again uses such language as came from him, chap. iii. and xvi. Occasionally he relapses into despondency, but it is of an humbler and gentler kind. The dark hour is over; the anger, the impatience, the bitterness, seem gone. He still wonders at the unexplained mysteries of God's providence towards the righteous, and the still more inexplicable enigma of his dealings with evil doers. This appears in chapters xxi., xxiv. and xxvii.; but in the same connection, he shows that he understands and can describe their final catastrophes as well as those who had wrongly charged him with holding that God actually and personally favors the wicked. In chap. xxiii., he mourns the hidings of the divine countenance; "O *that I knew where I might find him;*" but it is still with the great hope, weakened it may be, but not lost: "*I cannot trace him, but He knoweth the way that I take*, and when He hath sufficiently tried me, I shall come forth as gold." In chap. xxvi., he shows that he can talk of the divine power and works as loftily as Bildad, though without his pretension. In chap. xxviii., we have his sublime soliloquy on the unknown and unknowable in the divine wisdom. In chap. xxix., he mournfully recalls "the moons of old," and mourns at the remembrance of his departed joys. In the most natural way, whilst disdaining all false humility, he recounts the acts which had made "the poor to bless him," and "the widow's heart to sing for joy." Following this, in that most eloquent vindication, chap. xxxi. where his words come to a close, we find him challenging his accusers to a review of his life, and concluding with a most solemn appeal to the Punisher of falsehood and Vindicator of truth. It is all most truthful, as well as most pathetic, and so far from seeming like boasting, it adds to the power of that most humble confession which is brought from him, not by the arguments of his opponents, but by that divine presence at which he alone is melted, whilst the others stand confounded and amazed. Even here there abides with him the power of that glorious hope, tempering his confession, so as to bring forth the fruit of soothing penitence instead of fell despair. It was, in fact, this utterance of chap. xix., which begins that preparation for complete submission, and for the revelation of the divine favor, which commentators have so variously assigned in their artificial and unappreciative divisions of "the drama."

EXCURSUS II.

A Remarkable Difference between the Speeches of Job and those of the other Speakers. The Pausing, Soliloquizing Character of the former, and the seeming Unconsciousness they betray of Surrounding Persons. Bearing of this feature on the alleged inconsistencies of Chaps. xxi.–xxviii.

CHAP. XXI. 17.

HOW OFT GOES OUT THE LIGHT OF WICKED MEN.

This is the rendering of our English Version, and it is the only one that would have been thought of, if there had not been supposed to be some *exigentia loci* that calls for another. It is the simplest and easiest translation of plain Hebrew words in the only sense in which they are found, wherever they occur in the Hebrew Scriptures. This supposed difficulty is in the apparently sudden change from a vivid description of the impunity and prosperity of the wicked to an equally vivid painting of their destruction. It may seem less strange, however, when we call to mind that there is a similar transition, Ps. lxxiii. The wicked are there described as prospering: "their eyes stand out with fatness; they are not in trouble as other men;" the pious are stumbled at the sight, *etc.* Soon we have a very different strain commencing with that most suggestive particle אַךְ: "Yes, verily, Thou dost set slippery places for them; how are they brought to desolation as in a moment! they are consumed with terrors." The transition, in itself considered, is equally striking; but in the interval, which is unmeasured for us, Asaph had "gone into the sanctuary;" whether it mean the outward temple or tabernacle, or the private sanctuary of his own pious meditations. There he recovered himself; there he saw that there was another side to the matter.

Here there is no interval of outward action, nor is there mentioned any subjective one. But a transition must have taken place. The consistency of the passage, even its dramatic consistency, demands something of the kind. It may have been very short—but a second or two in fact—for the thoughts often travel very far, and that, too, consecutively, in a brief interval of time. Is the supposition of such a pause an arbitrary one? or are there rational grounds to be found for it in the peculiar character of the drama, in the conditions of the speakers, especially the principal one, and in the modes of utterance natural to such conditions? In the very beginning, we are told, the friends sat a long time with Job in perfect silence; "for they saw that his suffering (הַכְּאֵב) was very great." May we not suppose shorter intervals of a similar character to have occurred in other parts of the discussion, with resumptions seemingly sudden and disconnected? It is easy to imagine the scene. They wait for him while his short panting breath (xvii. 1) forbids his speaking, or when they see him drop his head and voice, and become absorbed in reverie. Such pauses, whether for these or other reasons, would especially occur in the speeches of Job. Those of the friends are direct and continuous. Whether it be argument, or appeal, or sententious and didactic lecturing, it goes straight on to its close; and there are few, if any, cases where we fail to see a direct connection throughout. This comes from their condition as cool, theoretical or oratorical pleaders, with nothing in their circumstances, bodily or spiritual, to produce such musing or ejaculatory pauses. The friends are, indeed, figurative and rhetorical; but Job is vehement, exclamatory, appealing, expostulating—crying out from his extreme anguish—now addressing the friends, then protesting unto God—praying, deprecating, at times talking or muttering to himself like a man in delirium. In one place (ix. 35), he feels and says, that he "is not his perfect self," in other words, out of his composed and rational mind. The friends may be always near him; yet he sometimes talks as one hardly conscious of their presence. Chapter xiv. seems almost wholly made up of this unconscious soliloquizing.

The same may be said of chapter xxiii. There are times when everything seems lost sight of but his pain and that ever-present feeling of God's estrangement. Again, it is the haunting idea of some unseen malignant persecutor that breaks up the continuity of his thoughts, and drives him to what seems almost a frantic raving, as in some parts of ch. xvi.

This spasmodic style, and this unconscious, soliloquizing feature, which make such a difference between the speeches of Job and those of the friends, has not been sufficiently attended to by commentators. In it, perhaps, may be found the solution of many difficulties and a rational means of explaining the inconsequential appearance of many passages. If this be called an imagination, it has its rational warrant. The scene is easily called up. As he sits groaning in the ashes (ii. 8), with head bowed down, in mournful silence—except when roused by some of their unfeeling taunts, or still more unfeeling exhortations to confession—his thoughts revolve in a way that grammatical rules cannot always connect, nor particles define. He starts from his musing, and, though it may have been but for a moment, his thoughts have drifted far, and, on resuming, they may even seem, perhaps, to be moving in what appears to be an opposite direction. If we closely study the place, however, there will be found something which reveals the position of these pauses, as well as any stage marks could do. It gives us, too, a glimpse of what he has been thinking of in the interval, and which has deflected the current. This is indicated in various ways. It is sometimes the resuming particle, such as an אוּלָם, an אָמְנָם, an אַךְ, a גַּם, and sometimes a כִּי, coming in in such a manner that we cannot easily connect what follows with what, to the eye, had immediately preceded: *ah yes—so it is—in very truth—yes, this also, etc.* They refer to the intervening thought, a protest, it may be, an appeal, a prayer, a deprecation, some new fear, or some sudden hope, which colors all that follows. Sometimes such a pause is to be inferred from the context. It is revealed by an apodosis which has no protasis apparently, unless it can be thus supplied, or, it may be, by the mere abruptness of the language. Job's religious emotions are to be regarded in the same way: now up, now down—sinking, as in xix. 20, 21; soaring, as in vers. 25-27 of the same chapter—utterly despondent, xiv. 10-12, then praying, ver. 13, finding encouragement from the prayer to put the great question, ver. 14, getting immediate assurance, as appears ver. 15, desponding again, ver. 19, and mourning as though death filled all his thoughts, vers. 21, 22. And so, too, after the great hope of chap. xix., lamenting again the hiding of God's countenance, chap. xxiii.: "*O that I knew where I might find Him.*"

In the speeches of the friends, we find, indeed, difficulties arising from the obscurities of rare words, or strange idioms; but they are philological, instead of logical. There are none of that peculiar kind we meet with in the musing and passionate appeals of Job. These may be passages perfectly clear in themselves; but the difficulty is that of finding the thought connection between them. The idea of a silent, soliloquizing or musing interval, be it more or less, elapsing between them, and during which the thoughts take a different direction, gives the only way of explaining, whilst furnishing, too, a strong argument that the explanation is real.

Thus here, in chap. xxi., the first break of the kind is at ver. 16. To that point the description of the wicked is clearly continuous. Then we find language which certainly seems to make a jar with what precedes. There is something wrong, something to be deprecated, about the wicked after all. He stops and thinks; then raises his head and talks to himself. His language seems introspective, rather than addressed to any outside hearers. A new thought comes up: However prosperous they may sometimes seem to be, bad men have, after all, no security. They are not independent of a higher Power. Even when we see no break in their prosperity, there is something in it which excites distrust. Job "goes into the sanctuary" of his own thoughts. Then "understands he better about their end." The interjection הֵן, with which he begins, shows the new feeling. He calls attention to it as somewhat differing from what he had said, though not contradicting it:

Behold! Their *good* is not in their own power;
The way of wicked men, O be it far from me.

Another brief pause, and the other view is taken with still increasing confidence; ver. 16 being a transition facilitating its adoption.

One thing is quite clear. The more modern interpreters are right in supposing that in ver. 17, and in what follows, there is a reference to the very words the friends have used in various places, but it is not by way of irony, nor of sharp dissent that he employs them. They come up to his recollection with the feeling that there is truth in them, however one-sided they may appear. It is, in fact, an assent, only expressed in a more impassioned way. This greatly one-sided picture of Zophar (chap. xx.), leaving out, as it does, some of the most obvious facts belonging to a complete representation of the case, together with Job's sense of its injustice as cruelly insinuated against himself, sets him strongly in the direction he first takes. He sees only that side. Then comes up the thought that he may be going too far, and committing, perhaps, the same one-sided error. He is proceeding towards the very position they had charged him with, namely that God actually favors the wicked. There is, too, something within him which tells him that he would not, after all, exchange his *pain* for their *pleasure*, even as he himself has painted it: "The counsel of the wicked be it far from me" (xxi. 16). And so, we may suppose, comes the intervening check and the confession expressed in brackets as really belonging to the feeling of the passage:

> (Yes, truth ye say): How oft goes out the light of wicked men!
> When comes upon them their calamity,
> And God in wrath allots them deadly pains!

This third line has every appearance of being intended as a qualifying of what he had said above (2d clause of ver. 13) about their easy death. That may be often so; but other cases come to mind of their dying in pain and horror. So the Psalmist had said: "There are no bands (or pangs, חַרְצֻבּוֹת, *strictures*, *tortures*, a word very similar to חֲבָלִים here) in their death." But when the vision had been cleared by a higher power, he sees them "standing on slippery places and *utterly consumed with terrors*."

What, then, is the fearful thought to which Job alludes, ver. 6, in view of the prosperity of the wicked?

> Which when I call to mind, then am I sore afraid,
> And trembling taketh hold on all my flesh.

At first view, it would seem to be this prosperity in itself considered, as the object of his jealousy, that seems so awful to him; but what follows, after ver. 17, shows that even there another idea was mingling with this, and contained the real element of horror. The immunity of the wicked seen in one view, their downfall, their utter ruin, sometimes, here upon earth, so frequently seen in another (as shown by examples Job could not have been ignorant of, and that, too, coming often out of the very circumstances of their prosperity), the apparent absence of any rule or distinction in relation to it—all this produced a feeling of utter bewilderment and confusion; especially as called up by the thought of his own unintelligible affliction. Some wicked men prospered all through, others overthrown by the most dire calamities; he cannot understand it; taken in connection with his own case, it utterly dismays him. Is there one that rules over this dark enigmatical world? This is the question that appals him. He is again approaching the verge of that precipice he was so near ix. 24. It was that dark thought of an undistinguishing physical fatality described Ecclesiastes ix. 2:

> The all, according as it is to all—one fate to all,
> The just, the vile, the good, the pure, the one with sin defiled;
> As to the good, so unto him that sins;
> As to the perjured, so to him who fears to break an oath.

An indifferent Deity! The thought is horrible; he cannot bear it; perhaps there *is* no God at all. The suggestion terrifies him; trembling taketh hold on all his flesh, ver. 6. But here he is in a better state. The influence of that enrapturing hope (xix. 25) has not been lost, and his faith in God is strengthened by that idea of a final judgment so clearly expressed ver. 30, notwithstanding the efforts that some have made to pervert it to a different

and even an opposite meaning. It is that great idea which has shown itself in all the religious ethics of the world—the thought of a "judgment to come," more deeply rooted in the moral constitution of man than even that of a future life when regarded irrespective of it. The idea may have accompanying it less of time and locality. It is attended with great eschatological difficulties, which even the Scripture does not fully clear up; but still it holds on. The human mind cannot wholly surrender it. At some time, and in some way, all shall be made right, however dense "the clouds and darkness" that now surround the throne of God. Such thoughts seem to mingle together in the mind of Job, as they are irregularly brought out in his introspective passionate way.

In the course of the chapter there are other musings of a similar kind. In vers. 23-26, his thoughts wander to the differences in the deaths of individuals, whether religious or wicked, and there comes up again a similar skeptical feeling:

Alike do they lie down in dust.

But it is no more at war with this higher view of the judgment, than the similar language in Ecclesiastes. In ver. 31 there is another seeming transition, describing the wicked man as carried to the tomb, just as the righteous is—and all, of every character, following on in the same thronged way. The conclusion is, "your comforting" (if ye will call it so) is in vain. It is only a partial view ye take, and there is, consequently, much of falsehood and deception in your answer; see ver. 34.

In taking such a view of Job's speeches, not merely in respect to this question of pauses, but in regard to their strange subjective character, their evident soliloquizing, their sudden changes, and the striking differences, in all these respects, between them and those of his friends, the first feeling is one of wonder at the dramatic skill which has thus depicted them. A deeper thinking carries us beyond this. It is not mere dramatic painting that we have before us. No one *invented* this character. It is a reality—a true soul-experience. A man *did* thus suffer; he *was* thus tempted and forsaken; he *did* thus speak. It is substantially true, as we have elsewhere attempted to show, in respect to the language of chap. xiv. and xix. (INT. THEISM, pa. 9). No human genius, even though accompanied by the highest skill in dramatic fiction that has been exhibited in modern times, ever so entered into the depths of the soul, or could have drawn such a picture, unless he drew from the life—not the outer merely, but the most interior life laid bare to him by some revelation of the human coming from a sphere above the plane of any mere human experience. We may say this with confidence when we consider what caricatures have been almost all attempts to draw the religious life as mere invented fiction, although taking all the aids they could get from the Scriptures. If such an experience is a thing unknown to writers of fiction now—if all their attempts to set it truly forth are failures—it was still more unknown, it was still more beyond the inventive powers of any ancient writers, if we may suppose any such attempts to have been made in the early day. This story of Job, his sufferings, his speeches, his prayers, his expostulations, his almost frantic appeals, his despondency, his despair, his exalted hope so soon followed by relapses into darkness, his deep penitence, his most pathetic confession, his full submission at the close—all this is from a higher than human pencil. Compare it with any thing in the literature of the world, whether we take the earlier or the later date. What is most remarkable throughout the whole is that cleaving unto God which no vehemence of expostulation can sunder, even though he seems to see the Almighty repelling his approach: "Let Him slay me, still will I wait"—still "trust in Him," xiii. 15. And here we find the very centre of his deepest anguish. It was not mere bodily suffering that most affects him; though that seems to have been indescribably great. It is the thought of God as "hiding His face from him." But when it goes beyond even this, to the conception of God as estranged from the world, as utterly indifferent to the affairs of men—when he is in danger of losing the idea of a Providence altogether, and even of a personal God at all—it is this that drives him wild, that "fills him with terror," and causes "trembling to take hold of all his flesh," xxi. 6. Then, too, how is the contrast heightened when, in his lowest extremity, after that piteous cry, xix. 21, there is suddenly let into his mind the thought

that he shall yet see Eloah—when and where he knows not, thinks not—see Him with *his own eyes*—see Him a "*reconciled God*," no longer a stranger or an enemy. The hope fills his soul with an insupportable rapture, under which his poor diseased body faints away, Vor freudigem Beben und höchster Sehnsucht, as EWALD describes it without going at all beyond those strong Hebrew words, כָּלוּ כִלְיֹתַי בְּחֵקִי. No man, we say, *invented* this. His friends, men of pure and lofty thoughts, in themselves considered, could not understand it, and no cool writer of fiction could have made even an approach towards describing such an experience. There is nothing known to men by which they could draw such a character by mere dramatic delineation. It is indeed dramatic, but only as a part of God's *acted revelation* in the world. The record of it, therefore, though through some human medium worthy of the sacred office, may be supposed to be made under the divine guidance, and is substantially true in the language, as well as in the acts, and in the soul-exercises recorded.

In order to avoid what is deemed an inconsistency, and even a contradiction, in the speech of Job, many interpreters give to כַּמָּה, in the 17th verse of chap. xxi., the sense of *how seldom* instead of *how often*, making it almost equivalent to a denial that wicked men are ever visited with calamity at all. They then supply this particle before a number of clauses that follow: "*How seldom* goes out the lamp, &c.; *how seldom* does their destruction come upon them; *how seldom* are they as stubble, or as the chaff, which the wind drives away." There is no reason, grammatical or philological, why they should not go on, in the same way, to supply it before the clauses of ver. 19: "*How seldom* does Eloah treasure up his iniquity for his sons? *How seldom* does He requite (*punish*) him, so that he knows it?" The tenses and the order of the words are alike, and no reason except this supposed *exigentia loci* can be given why they should not be rendered in a similar way. Here, however, at ver. 19, the difficulty is supposed to be escaped, by giving the futures—though just like the futures before—the interrogative and imprecatory turns: "Will God treasure up his iniquity for his children (leaving him in prosperous impunity)? Rather let Him requite it to himself (the wicked man), that he may know." Or the first clause of ver. 19 is taken as Job's sarcastic quotation, or anticipation rather, of their own language: "God layeth up his iniquity for his children, does he? rather let Him repay it to the sinner himself." It represents Job as holding that, with very rare exceptions, the wicked man is prospered during his own life, and that it is no answer to this to say that the evil comes upon his children. Job arraigns the divine conduct, and makes bold to say what God ought to do: "Rather let Him requite it to himself"—make him pay his own debts, not bring it on his poor children: "Let his own eyes see his own destruction; let him drink himself of the wrath of the Almighty." Now this certainly represents Job in an awful light. It is not only a false view he holds of the wicked man's lot, as unbroken prosperity, but a profane fault-finding with God for letting it come upon his children, instead of punishing the sinner himself. The kind of argument he is supposed to make in showing the injustice of this, is still more profane. "The wicked man is dead," so is he made to reason—dead without pain (see ver. 13), and it cannot trouble him whether his children suffer or not; he has no will nor wish in the matter; there has been "peace in his day," what difference does it make to him what comes after him. A more impious sentiment is not to be found in the whole book; a more impious sentiment is not to be found any where, than is here ascribed to Job. His strong language in other cases, with all its seeming irreverence, may be regarded as coming from spasms of intolerable pain, making him to cry out of seeming cruelty. His vehement expostulations with God, though sometimes terrific, do actually show the depth and the preciousness of the divine idea in his soul. It is revealed in his very despair. But here, in respect to matters outside of himself, he deliberately charges, or is supposed to charge, God with the grossest injustice, and profanely, nay, even sneeringly, advises Him as to what would be a more suitable proceeding: "Let Him requite it to the man himself, and not to his children, who are innocent, and about whom, now that he has gone, after having had his own selfish uninterrupted day of prosperity, he cares nothing;" for "what concern hath he in his house after him?"

On this hypothesis, these supposed interrogations of Job, are really the most direct assertions that the wicked man is very rarely, if he is ever, punished; whilst some of his language, thus regarded, is so directly in the face of other Scriptures as to give the Rationalist UMBREIT the idea that it was intended for that very purpose: "'How seldom are the wicked driven away like chaff before the wind?' as though Job, or the writer of Job, meant to take a position directly in the face of the 1st Psalm." This is UMBREIT's exegetical wisdom. He actually supposes a *polemic* intention here with respect to that portion of Scripture: Gegen eine einseitige und lieblose Auslegung dieses Psalms *polemisirt* recht eigentlich Hiob. UMBREIT, p. 167.

But to come back to the philological argument; all this is answered by turning to the Concordance of Noldius. This particle כמה is given by him as occurring in eleven passages cited. In no single place in the Scripture has it any other meaning than that of *how often, how many, how long,* &c.—*quot! quoties! quanta!* There is not a single one in which the rendering *how seldom, how rarely, how few, how little* (*quantula*) would not wholly change or completely reverse the sense intended. Ps. lxxviii. 40 is referred to by DELITZSCH and others, but a glance at the passage shows that it is the other way: כמה ימרוהו, "*how oft* did they rebel against him?" That is, very often, *sæpissime.* Job xiii. 23 is cited as though כמה לי עונות should be read: "how few are my sins?" but this is felt at once to be out of harmony with the context and the spirit of the appeal. Whatever Job's own opinion may have been as to the number of his sins, the address is evidently made to one who is supposed to regard them as many. This is shown by what every reader must feel, namely, that the substitution there of *how few* for *how many,* takes away all the force of the supplication. It is so in other languages. *Quot, quoties, quanta, ποσάκις,* can never be rendered *how few* or *how seldom;* for that is a thing we seldom have occasion to ask about, whether the desire be to obtain information, or to express admiration, or wonder. The word for it in Hebrew, should there be occasion, would be מְעַט, with some interrogative or explanatory particle, as Job x. 20, הֲלֹא מְעַט יָמַי, "*are not my days few?*" (see also Isaiah xxix. 17); or some such kind of language as we have Ps. xxxix. 5, "Make me to know (or let me know) the measure of my days מה היא *what it is,* מֶה חָדֵל אָנִי, *how transient, how frail I am.*" Another mode is resorted to by making Job's language here to be ironic, but this is so inconsistent with the pathos and dignity of the passage, that it needs no formal answer.

Whatever ingenuity may be shown in such reconciling expositions, it becomes of no avail from the fact that the same supposed difficulty meets us in other places where no device of exegesis can get rid of it. Thus in ch. xxvii., from vers. 13 to 23, there is given by Job a most unmistakable picture of the doom of the wicked, painted in colors surpassing those of Zophar in ch. xx., or of any other one of the disputants: "His children are destroyed by the sword or by famine; his widow shall not weep; he buildeth his house like a moth; terrors take hold on him; a tempest stealeth him away in the night; as by a storm is he hurled out of his place (see Prov. xiv. 32; 1 Sam. xxv. 29); God casts his vengeance upon him—men hiss him out of his place." Very numerous and ingenious have been the attempts to settle the difficulty here, if it be a difficulty. Some would re-arrange the text, so as to give the passage to Zophar, in whose mouth they think it would be more consistent. KENNICOTT would bring in his numerous emendations. For other attempted solutions, see CONANT'S very valuable annotation. ROSENMUELLER solves it in one way; UMBREIT in another; some make it an interpolation, and so on. The perplexity is increased by the way in which each solver (UMBREIT for example) dwells on the wisdom of his own solution, and so complacently eulogizes the genius of this most "skillful dramatic poet," to whom he confidently ascribes it, whilst calling other attempts "Cimmerian darkness," although their authors thought them as wise as his own. EWALD'S view of xxvii. 13-23, although it cannot be accepted as a satisfactory solution on this hypothesis, contains some things worthy of note. "It is the turning-point," he says, "in the development of Job's dark destiny. The removal of the doubts presented demand, as it were, a new and sure beginning. Job begins to feel what an infinite salvation there lies in the consciousness of innocence, how through it he

has been delivered in the most extreme peril, and now, with the great gain of a noble experience, and of inward strength acquired, stands on the threshold of a new time. This consciousness, so hardly won, has a retroactive effect upon his view of the dark side of life, giving him a stand-point whence he may see how much there must be in the world and in God that is now incomprehensible, and that, though the wicked may seem to prosper, and the pious to suffer, yet is there an eternal order of development, in which innocence shall not be without its fruit, nor guilt go unpunished. Thus the doubts, not wholly set aside, but made more easy to bear, and deprived of their power to hurt, retire into the back-ground. Job has clearly expressed the yearning anticipations of his soul, and given utterance to the purest and highest truths, thereby gaining a full triumph, and taking the victor's place in the contest. For he gives up nothing of his fundamental idea; since in reference to the whole matter in controversy, he returns to his first position, where he stands like a rock, maintaining his innocence against every assault." EWALD, Das Buch Ijob, 2d Ed., pa. 245. This is very well said; but it contains some things far-fetched, however ingenious. It makes Job too logical. It strives too much after a doctrinal consistency, and yet in what is said about the new-acquired consciousness and the taking of new stand-points, there is something which may be claimed as substantially in harmony with what we have here endeavored to set forth, namely: that the emotional in Job, the musing, introspective temperament which is taken up with its own revolving exercises, and thinks little of outward consistency, is predominant in all he says—thereby presenting that striking contrast between his speeches and those of the friends, which cannot be too much insisted on in the interpretation of the Book.

To sum up, it may be said, that in such passages as have occasioned this comment, Job is evidently affected by three influences—outward influences we might call them in partial distinction from the inward state on which we have been dwelling. He perceives the falsehood of the strong pictures of the wicked man's misfortunes in this world, which the friends present as exceptionless and universal. He feels keenly, too, the injustice of their indirect application to himself; and all this sets him on the opposite tack, as we may say. After proceeding some distance in this direction, there comes in that higher consciousness of which EWALD speaks, modifying the description and even turning it the other way. That he does not perceive, and therefore makes no open provision against the logical or rhetorical jar, comes from the musing, pausing, introspective, outwardly unconscious, inwardly self-conscious, mode of thought and speech, so characteristic of him, or from the fact that a good deal of the time he is talking to God, to whom his logical consistency is of no consequence, or to himself, by whom all its defects are consciously supplied. This admitted, the absence of connection is accounted for, and, instead of being surprised at it, we are led to expect what may be called the emotional, rather than the logical, transitions.

A third reason for the seeming inconsistency of Job is of a lower kind, but still consistent with purity and integrity of character. The friends seem to assume towards him a higher moral position in picturing the wicked man's ruin. Job's desire to repel this false assumption of didactic superiority is a right one. It leads him, however, after he has sufficiently denied what was fallacious in their too one-sided descriptions, to take the other course by way of showing that he understands the case as well as they do—that he has not been an inattentive or obtuse observer of human life, and that, if he chooses, he can even go beyond them in all such picturings. It is a feeling similar to that which leads him to take down the lofty-talking Bildad, when expatiating, as the latter does in chap. xxv., upon the greatness of the divine works, as though he would give Job a lesson here. The one whom he thus assumes to teach properly replies, by showing that he too has thought upon these things, that he too can talk in this strain, should it be necessary, and even outdo him in such an oratorical effort. To see this, compare chapters xxv. and xxvi.

In general, however, Job's thoughts and words are from his inner world. He cares little for logical consistency, because less than they is he thinking of an audience, or of an antagonist—unless it be that seeming antagonism or divine estrangement over which he is ever mourning. It is over the tumultuous, volcanic flood of his own thoughts, he is constantly brooding, and bringing them out to light. This he does in that irregular, broken

way of which we find so many unmistakable examples, leading to the conclusion that in a proper consideration of this dramatic feature, there is found, not only a solution of every seeming hiatus, but also very much of the true impressiveness of this sublime production. It is from this, too, as may be said again, that we get a conviction of the objective reality of the whole action, which no talk about artistical and dramatic skill can set aside.

EXCURSUS III.

ON THE יוֹם עֲבָרוֹת OR DIES IRARUM.

CHAP. XXI. 30.

TO THE DAY OF DOOM THE WICKED MAN IS KEPT;
TO THE DAY OF MIGHTY WRATH ARE THEY BROUGHT FORTH.

The more carefully we study the translation of this passage in our English Version, and as given by DR. CONANT, the more clear will it become that it presents the substantial meaning. It agrees with the old versions, VULGATE, SYRIAC and LXX., as it appears in its HEXAPLAR SYRIAC translation. On the same side is RASCHI, also the best of the old commentators as cited in POOLE'S SYNOPSIS, together with GESENIUS, PAREAU, CONANT, and others of later times. On the other side, is the formidable array of HEILIGSTEDT, UMBREIT, DILLMANN, DELITZSCH, *et al.* Had the verse stood by itself, we hazard nothing in saying that no other translation than that of E. V. and LUTHER would have been thought of. It is its apparent disagreement with a false hypothesis, that has led to the varied comment.

חָשַׂךְ simply means *restraint, cohibuit;* whether *from* a thing, or *for* a purpose, depends upon the preposition, or the context. So הוּבַל simply means *brought forth* or *out;* whether *from* or *to*, or *for* what purpose, to be determined in like manner. It may be: *held back from danger or harm*, in which case the preposition מ, expressed or implied, would seem to be indispensable; or it may mean *kept, reserved for*, where the preposition ל would alone give the sense demanded. An example of this, which GESENIUS deems conclusive from its exact similarity to the present passage, is found ch. xxxviii. 23: "which I have reserved," חשכתי, "to the time of trouble" (לְעֶת צָר), "to the day (לְיוֹם) of battle and war." So the other verb יוּבָלוּ: "They are brought forth." How? The context shows. *From, to* or *in?* The preposition determines. In Isai. lv. 12 (cited for the later view, but wholly inapplicable), "they are brought forth *in* peace," בשלום (ב not ל). The unsuitableness of this reference appears from the fact that it would prove too much. The wicked would be not only brought forth from danger "at the day of wrath" (if that can be the meaning of ליום), but they are also brought forth *triumphantly*—not merely saved, but saved in a striking or processional manner, as though God made them conspicuous objects of His favor. It cannot mean, *brought out of trouble;* for on the very hypothesis demanded by this mode of exegesis, Job has been setting forth, and is still setting forth their uninterrupted prosperity. It cannot mean "brought out," so as to be spared from death, if "the day of wrath" meant that; for such an idea would involve a contradiction on either hypothesis. Most absurd here is ROSENMUELLER, who interprets it that "in the day of God's wrath the wicked men are brought to the sepulchre by way of deliverance from evils: Die irarum Dei *deducuntur* ad sepulchrum (ut supra x. 19) malis erepti improbi;" that is, "they are taken away before the evil," or "from the evil to come." This is the very thing Isaiah says of the righteous, lvii. 1; whilst Job here is made to say, or to approve of saying, just the contrary. The insuperable objection, how-

ever, to this rendering lies in the preposition employed for both verbs before יום. There is no way of making this mean *from*, or *in*, or at. *At the day* might do sometimes as a rendering of ליום, where the context strongly demanded it; but here *to* or *for* the day gives such a facile sense that it repels every other. For a context precisely similar, see Prov. xvi. 1, רשע ליום רעה, "the wicked man for the day of evil." Compare also Prov. xxi. 31, "a horse for the day of battle;" Isaiah x. 3, "to *the day* of visitation;" Jer. xii. 3, "devote him to *the day* of slaughter." Why go away from the plain indication of the preposition, all the more conclusive from the fact that ליום here, and in all these cases, denotes the scene, the event, rather than time? DILLMANN feels the force of this, and it almost makes him retract the other interpretation, which only a supposed exigentia loci, arising out of a false hypothesis in regard to the whole chapter, leads him to adopt. "It cannot be denied," he says, "that for ליום we should rather expect ביום, whilst ל seems rather to denote aim and limit, as חשך with ל, xxxviii. 23, and יובל, x. 19 ('brought forth from the womb to the grave') and יובל לקברות, xxi. 32, just below." Comp. Jer. x. 19: "a lamb brought out to the slaughter;" the same Isaiah liii. 7; Hos. x. 7; xii. 2; Ps. xlv. 15.

Again, does it look like an idea so traditional and universal that wicked men are specially spared in a day of calamity (whether it refer to general or private judgments), and that in days of God's wrath they are brought forth in processional triumph? Let any one study the Proverbs of Solomon's collecting, the best ethical authority for this purpose, and he will see in what a variety of ways the opposite idea is set forth: "The wicked for the day of evil." How universal the aphorism that, in some way, wickedness will bring ruin upon the wicked. The proverb just referred to is almost in the very language of this passage. Its testimony to the human ethical consciousness would be amply sufficient, if the idea did not meet us everywhere in the so-called Chockma or Hebrew Wisdom. The world's experience, too, is the other way. There are indeed cases of remarkable prosperity attending wicked men, but it is not general, so as to form the subject of an aphorism in traditional ethics. There is no such universality in the fact, to say the least, as the "signs of the way-farers" thus interpreted would give it. Especially would it be out of harmony with the best views we can get of the early Arabian world. From the earliest Eastern poetry, as well as from the Koran, do we derive just the contrary idea. When Mohammed threatens the robber Kafirs, or unbelievers, with the old dogma that wicked prosperity is in danger of a downfall, they are always represented as replying: "Ah, that is just what we and our fathers have been threatened with of old; it is all a fable (a saying) of the *ancients*." Every scholar is familiar with the Greek doctrine of Nemesis, carried even to the superstitious length of holding that mere prosperity of itself, without crime, was dangerous, or that it indicated some fearful doom to which the prosperous man was reserved. The same eschatological idea, though without time or place, comes forth in the language of the Old Testament: "The wicked shall not stand in the judgment," Ps. i. 5; "The upright shall have dominion over them on the *morning*" (Ps. xlix. 15), or the great *dies retributionis* for which the earliest Arabian that we know of uses the same expression.*

If, on the other hand, we regard Job's pictures here as of a mixed kind, irregular and impassioned—now setting forth the prosperity of the wicked, all the more strongly from the remembrance of his own misery, and dwelling on certain items (xxi. 11) from the contrast his vivid imagination finds in them to his own forlorn condition—then checking himself and dilating upon the other view, of which he must have known many examples in his own worldly experience—it is not difficult to account for what follows. The very absence of any visible rule in the present state of things, would lead to the thought of some יום עברות, some great judgment-scene, however indeterminable or inconceivable its time and locality. It was this feeling that created the idea, and led to the ethical lore of "the way-passers" as the common carriers of the traditions and doctrines of the peoples. The impunity of

* LOKMAN, as quoted in the Kitab 'ulagani; KOSS, as cited by SHARASTANI, 437 (CURETON's Ed.), and HARIRI, Seance xxv.

wicked men is certainly not one of these *world-sayings;* and could it be supposed it would be directly in the face of that Vergeltungslehre of which the Rationalist commentators have so much to say, as the universal doctrine of the ancient world.

There may, perhaps, be the understood meaning: *reserved, held back from* present evils, *for* the day of איד, the day of the great calamity, and that may also be gotten from RASCHI, and from the *servatur* of the Vulgate, whether in the sense of *preserved* or *watched for*, but this would only the more confirm the idea of the great איד to which such a *reserving* is preparatory.

According to the common interpretation of xlii. 7, Job is commended for saying of, or concerning, God: *what is* right (נָכוֹן, *firm, constans, consistens*). But what a picture of daring irreverence, and of profane scoffing, even, does he present, according to the view some take of this whole chapter! It has three aspects: 1. He is supposed to describe the wicked as enjoying uninterrupted prosperity through the present life, then leaving it without pain, and with no concern for any thing that may come after them, which very unconcern is represented as a portion of their good. 2. In what Job says from ver. 17 and onward, where he seems to qualify the sweeping character of the first assertions, he is only sneering at the language of the friends, repeating it insincerely or in a taunting manner, and thus actually giving a stronger emphasis to his first assertions. 3. Not content with this, he adopts, as the supposed meaning of "the way-passers," that the wicked not only go on with impunity in the common course of life, but that they are specially favored in a time of great calamity, and in *the day of wrath* (great wrath, *wraths,* in the plural, which must mean God's wrath) they are brought out in triumph (יובלו, in a procession as it were). And this is done by God! It is not merely an *overlooking* (as Paul seems to say Acts xvii. 30), a letting men go their ways, but a special favoring of the wicked. He brings them out in a sort of processional pomp, and keeps them from harm in His *dies irarum.* RENAN here goes beyond all others who take this view:

> Au jour fatal, le méchant est épargné,
> Au jour de la colère divine, il est soustrait au châtiment,

as though God specially shielded him when the divine vengeance is shown upon the earth. Now add to this Job's assuming to tell God (ver. 19) what He *ought to do,* according to this interpretation, namely, to "punish the bad man himself in his lifetime, and not let it come on his innocent children, of whose sufferings he has no feeling"—and there is reached the very climax of impiety. He could not, moreover, have gone more directly in the face of his own caution (ver. 22): "shall a man teach God? teach Him who judges the high?" And yet all this comes directly from the mode of interpreting this chapter (xxi.) adopted by DELITZSCH and others.

The extreme Rationalist, MERX, would also represent Job as teaching in this passage, ver. 30, that the wicked are specially favored; but he has a much easier way of doing it. Seeing clearly that the text, as it stands, can only be interpreted of the wicked being brought out for judgment and perdition, he inserts, with his usual recklessness, the negative לא, making it read: "the wicked are *not* reserved to the day of calamity; they are not brought forth for the day of wrath." That is the way in which he makes them escape, and that is the strange doctrine he thus forces into the mouths of "the way-passers." But in doing this he confirms, in the most decided manner, the other sense for which we contend. It is a confession that it is the only one admissible unless the negative לא, for which he has no warrant whatever, is inserted. In his note he does not hesitate to charge the Jewish critics, those worshippers of words and letters, with having, for dogmatic purposes, designedly changed the text.

EXCURSUS IV.

CHAP. XXII. 5–13.

THE HARSH CRIMINATIONS OF ELIPHAZ.

These verses present one of the great difficulties of the book. The apparent harshness of the charges made against Job, as they appear in our English Version, and in other translations, seem inexplicable, whether viewed in their moral or in their mere dramatic aspect. The view to be taken of them, however, depends very much on the mode of rendering, and this again takes much of its coloring from the meaning given to ver. 5, and especially the starting particle הֲלֹא. In one view it represents Job as not only guilty of enormous sins, but as so notorious for them as to put denial out of the question: "Is not thy wickedness great, and thine iniquities infinite?" Did Eliphaz actually mean to charge him thus? The difficulties in the way of this are so great, that we are driven to a close study of the language, to see if there may not be some modification, to say the least, of such a rendering.

Much, as has been said, depends upon the right view of the starting word, in itself, and as affected by the context. The Hebrew language having no modal forms, the question whether such an expression as הֲלֹא רָעָתְךָ רַבָּה is indicative (under an interrogative form), and thus directly assertive, or whether it is potential, conjectural (or hypothetical), must depend very much on the particles and constructive forms that accompany or follow. *Is not* thy evil great? *May not* thy evil be great? *Would not* thy evil be great? Either of these might be given as the sense in certain connections. הֲלֹא may express doubt, as in 1 Sam. xxi. 12: "Is this David the king?" or "can this be David the king?" It may be a true interrogative seeking information, as 1 Kings i. 2; or it may be a form of most positive assertion, as Numbers xxiii. 26: "Did I not surely tell thee?" or it may be rendered "perhaps," as in Deut. xxxi. 17, or "it may be," denoting conjecture, 1 Sam. xx. 37: "Perhaps the arrow is beyond thee." There are two strong arguments for the conjectural or hypothetical rendering here—one contextual or circumstantial, the other grammatical. 1st. All the facts of the case are most clearly against the positive or indicative rendering. Though the form is interrogative, it would, in fact, if thus taken, be the most emphatic way of saying, not only that "Job's wickedness was great, and his sins innumerable," but that all the world knew it, and that he himself, the very man appealed to, knew it as something that could not be denied. He is not only a sinner, but a most notorious one. Now this cannot be the meaning. It would, in the first place, be in direct contradiction with the clearest assertions of the prologue: "a man pure and upright, fearing God, and departing from evil." It would, 2d, be inconsistent with the action of the friends themselves, who doubtless knew his reputation for righteousness and purity throughout the East, and who had, therefore, come so far to console him. 3d. It would be at war with that dramatic propriety of which some talk so much, that they should thus fall upon him, especially Eliphaz, who, in what he says iv. 3, 4, 6, had affirmed all these views of Job's religion and known integrity. Everything shows that they had formed, and had good reasons for forming, the highest estimate of his moral worth. When and where had they learned the contrary, that he must speak so positively and so undoubtingly about Job's crimes? See Note INT. THEISM, pa. 32. It is a difficulty which EWALD strongly feels. "Whence," says he, p. 225, "did Eliphaz derive his knowledge of the gross sins he ascribes to Job? Had he detected him in any such acts? Or could he bring any witnesses in proof of his charges? Impossible! Not only the whole book, but God himself directly contra-

dicts it." COCCEIUS had taken the ground that the charges were in their nature conjectural. UMBREIT treats this idea with contempt, and yet hardly seems aware of the immense difficulties that attend the other view of a strong positive assertion. ROSENMUELLER and others proceed in the same way. The conjectural supposition, however, is the most natural. Eliphaz did not know of any such crimes; he had no proof; he sought none; refers to none. The zeal, however, enkindled in the course of the dispute, led him to think there *might be* sins unknown, and which, perhaps, had slipped from the memory of Job himself in the days of his prosperity. If there were any sins at all, then those specified, he might think, would be the very ones that a man of power (גבר) and property like Job would be most likely to fall into occasionally, whilst maintaining something of a general character for probity. To such the speaker's partisan feeling would give a heightened coloring of atrocity. Still, they are all stated conjecturally or hypothetically, as the only means of accounting for the puzzling fact of his great losses and sufferings. Unjust as they are, yet, when thus viewed, the seeming accusations are stripped of much of their harshness. They may be the language of an injudicious and mistaken friend, especially moved to reproof because Job shows so little of acknowledgment and repentance. It is as though he had said to him: "There may be more evil in your case than you have probably thought; prosperity may have blinded your eyes; your sins may be אין קץ, not infinite in our mathematical sense of the term, but beyond your numbering—without estimate, that is, many more, and greater, than you have thought." In his vehemence Eliphaz uses hyperbolical language, but not intended to be taken literally in the sense of actual infinity, or even of anything beyond numbering.

Then there is the grammatical argument. The כי following, both as expressed in ver. 6, and implied in the 7th, and others succeeding, is dependent on הֲלֹא above: may it not be the case *that?* Then, in the verses following, it becomes specificative or illustrative of the general charge: "May not thy wickedness be so great, that during thy prosperous, unthinking life, thou mayest have wrongly taken a pledge from some poor man, stripped off a garment, not given water to the thirsty traveller, have sent away the widow unredressed, and even, in some cases, wronged the orphan?" There is an air of particularity about them, as though tentative of Job's conscience, that seems very much to favor the idea that these are just what COCCEIUS calls them, conjectural and hypothetical. The view thus taken of כי, as specificative, alone furnishes a satisfactory reason for the futures תמנע, תשקה, תפשיט, תחבל, that follow it in the succeeding clauses. The conditional hypothesis, making the construction the subjective, or consequential in the thought, alone accounts for them: "*Would* not thy wickedness be great," as הלא רעתך רבה may be rendered, or "would it not be great wickedness in thee," that thou *shouldst* take, or *shouldst* have taken a pledge," *etc.* If, on the other hand, we take כי, ver. 6, as independent, or render it *for* or *because*, it would not be easy to show a reason why the verb should not have been in the preterite (חָבַלְתָּ); just as in xv. 25 (which, on that view, would be a precisely similar case), כי is followed by נָטָה, and in ver. 26 by כִּסָּה. The only reason that can be given for the different form of the tenses here is that כי is truly dependent on the conjectural הלא above, whilst the futures are dependent on the specifying power of the particle here carrying the conjecture all through. The 8th verse is parenthetical, and in ver. 9 we have a preterite שִׁלַּחְתָּ, "*thou hast sent away;*" but such an intervening change is not only explicable grammatically, as affected by the previous parenthetical movement, but also rhetorically, as denoting the zeal of the speaker, carried away by his own vivid suppositions, and coming almost to look upon them as actual facts. In regard to these futures, translators and commentators have always found a difficulty if כי was to be rendered absolutely. The whole case is very clearly and concisely stated by JUNIUS as cited in POOLE'S SYNOPSIS: Quia status harum criminationum *conjecturalis* est, et magis in presumptionibus quam certis probationibus positus, *futuro* utitur: *pignus acceperis, nudaveris, etc.*

In the question, "*is not,*" or "*may not thy evil be great?*" there may be a looking back to the previous reflections as well as to the supposed changes that follow. It may refer to that idea of trafficking with God (ver. 2), or getting gain to one's self from some profiting we

may have fancied to accrue to Him from our defective virtue. Something like this is the idea of Good, who contends that תחבל, and the other futures that follow כי, should be rendered: "Thou wouldst oppress," "Thou wouldst strip," *etc.* That is, a man wicked enough (in the estimation of Eliphaz) to vindicate himself as Job does (or to think of profiting God by his religion) might be supposed capable of committing all these acts." There is a connection between רעה, the evil here (ver. 5), and the *religion* and *righteousness* mentioned above, as the things by which Eliphaz would represent Job as claiming to be profitable to God. Even admitting that there might be some such an outstanding account, though far less than Job perhaps imagined, still, in the judgment of Eliphaz, there was another balance to be settled: "Thine evil, too, may be very great," as well as thy religion by which thou thinkest to bring God into thy debt. All this is very unjust to Job, as we see it; but it prepares the way very naturally for the conjectural or hypothetical style of what follows.

Following this connection, we find a demand for the repetition of the same particle, הֲלֹא, as essential to the complete sense of the sixth verse: "May it not be that thou hast taken a pledge of thy brother for nought?" If its force goes through all these specifications, as both the context and the grammar require (that is, the future forms), then it actually belongs to the translation in each one, as something essential to its fair expression, and not as merely paraphrastic or explanatory. So Cocceius justly regards it, and, therefore, inserts *fortassis*: Num *fortassis* pignus cepisti a fratribus tuis sine causa, *etc.* To which he adds the note: Conjecturaliter et disjunctive explico, nulla repugnante grammatica, ne crudeliores sententias, quam ipsi amici, in Jobum cudam. Instead of *nulla grammatica repugnante*, Cocceius might have said: grammatica revera postulante.

So, too, ver. 8 is to be taken as language ascribed to Job by Eliphaz:

(Hast said) the land is for the strong;

not in so many words, but as indicated by his supposed deeds, which, the accuser would say, speak louder than words. Thou hast acted as though the land belonged to the strong. It is "*the language of the case*," to use a technic of the Arabian Grammarians. It represents the supposed spirit of the one thus spoken of. Thus Rabbi Tanchum in his Arabic Commentary on Lamentations iii. 36, maintains that the Hebrew words אֲדֹנָי לֹא רָאָה, *the Lord not see it* (badly rendered by E. V., *the Lord approveth not*), is, in fact, the language of the wicked to themselves, and not of the prophet, as our translation makes it with a great force upon ראה. "To subvert a man in his cause,—*the Lord does not see it*;" so their actions say.

If this general view be correct, then the conjectural or hypothetical idea goes also into the conclusion, ver. 10:

Wherefore, *it may be*, snares are round thee spread.

Otherwise it would seem like judicial exultation over the misery of Job. It does not, however, relate so much to the fact as to the conjectural reason: It may be that acts like these are the cause of all your trouble. Aside from the grammatical reasons, it may be truly said, that we are absolutely forced to some such view of the hypothetical character of these statements in order to avoid the most revolting supposition of such charges being directly and positively made without a particle of evidence. The warmth of disputation may have very naturally led to an uncharitable expression of suspicion and of harsh suppositions; but all beyond this is a violation of dramatic, as well as of moral, and logical consistency.

EXCURSUS V.

ON THE HEBREW WORD תּוּשִׁיָּה

AS OCCURRING JOB VI. 13, XI. 6, XII. 16, AND ESPECIALLY XXVI. 3.

This word is used not only by the Chokma writers, as they are called, but also by the Prophets. Like other Hebrew words of intelligence, it denotes both a form of truth and also the faculty of the mind that perceives it—being, in this respect, like our word *reason.* That it has the former aspect, Job xxvi. 3, appears from the verb הוֹדַעְתָּ and the parallelism which demands for it the sense of teaching. Hence an objection to EWALD'S rendering, *feste Einsicht,* in that place, as well as to the *Verständiges* of DILLMAN and ZÖCKLER. As denoting a power or state of mind, *Anschauung* would have been a better word. As a form of truth, it is the highest which the Hebrew language affords, unless it be the more general term חכמה regarded as including it. This is seen from its associations. Thus in Prov. iii. 21 it is something higher than מְזִמָּה, *sagacity, prudence;* Prov. viii. 14 (rendered in E. V. *sound wisdom*) it is joined with בִּינָה and עֵצָה; Prov. xviii. 1, it is the speculative, contemplative wisdom, to which the *recluse* (נִפְרָד) so earnestly devotes himself. It is ascribed to God, Isaiah xxviii. 29, and in a still more remarkable manner, Job xii. 16 (see Note thereon). *Truth* is the best rendering, if we take that word in its highest and broadest sense for the *reality of things* (see Webster's definition), or the truth fixed and *necessary,* in distinction from the flowing, the apparent, the phenomenal. DELITZSCH well defines it from J. H. MICHAELIS as *vera et realis sapientia,* although in his version he seems to limit its force. The objection is that this is too metaphysical for the Book of Job, or as J. D. MICHAELIS states it, *nimis a vulgari sensu remota.* Such words, he goes on to say, *philosophi in scholis condunt non plebs:* "schoolmen make them, not the people." But this only shows that he himself was no metaphysician, in the true sense of the term. What is the *sensus vulgaris?* The highest forms of truth have their seat in the common mind, as is shown by the fact, that language ever, in some way, makes names (the names that are wanted) before philosophy, as such, is ever heard of. The contemplative soul of Job was as capable of such an idea as that of MICHAELIS. PLATO'S distinction of the *ὄντα* and the *γιγνόμενα*, or *real being* as distinguished from the *phenomenal,* or ever-changing, is one that belongs to every thoughtful mind. PAUL makes it, 2 Cor. iv. 18, though carrying it to a sublimer height than Plato: "the *things seen* and the *things unseen,*" the temporal and the eternal; the latter not simply *unseen* as absent from a present personal sense, but as in their very being super-sensual. By giving, moreover, this higher and wider sense to תושיה, there is brought out the contrast evidently intended in the two clauses of xxvi. 3: the *first,* the teaching of the unlearned, or *the practical,* the second, the more speculative or contemplative wisdom—*the truth of things* in their widest sense (לָרֹב). The old derivation of this word was from יש the undeclinable substantive verb, as *οὐσία* (*essence, being*) is made from *εἰμί, ὤν* in Greek. GESENIUS departs from this; but the best commentators such as DELITZSCH, EWALD, *et al.,* have come back to it, making its true etymological sense to be *substantia, ὑπόστασις,* the solid, *the real—true being* (see DELIZSCH on this verse). So the Jewish Rabbinical writers have regarded it. In their philosophical discussions, they use the תושיה of the Old Scriptures as their term for the supersensual wisdom or philosophy. From it they have also made a technical distinction among philosophers or *wise men*(חכמים). They are the חכמי תושיה, the *metaphysici,* the speculative thinkers in distinction. from the חכמי המחקר, the *Physici,* or natural philosophers who proceed by experiment and induction (see BUXTORF *Lex. Chald.* 990, 819). Compare PAUL'S expression, 1 Cor. i. 20, *συζητητὰι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, seekers, inquirers, experimenters* (*Naturforscher*) of this world. Thus also is it used by such Jewish writers as LEVI BEN GERSON,

Philosophical words formed in this way from the old Hebrew are not fanciful or arbitrary. The idea on which they are founded are in the root words, and they came to the Rabbinical writers out of the demand for them as our own scientific, philosophical, or theological words derived from the Greek and Latin. FUERST also gives the sense *substantia*. See Notes on Job v. 12; vi. 13, and xii. 16.

EXCURSUS VI.

CHAP. XXVI. 5, 6, 7.

THE SHADES IN SHEOL. ABADDON, OR THE WORLD BELOW SHEOL. JOB'S VIEW OF THE POSITION OF THE MUNDUS, AND OF THE EARTH.

In chapter xxv., Bildad had been holding forth on God's glories in the worlds above, and His knowledge of celestial things. It would seem as though he meant to overawe and confound the unconfessing, impenitent man. Job turns the mind in another direction, or to the deeper mystery of the world below. All things, "in the earth, and under the earth," as well as above the earth, lie naked before the eye of God. Thus ver. 5, though seeming abrupt and unconnected, forms the transition to this deeper and more mysterious region. The argument is that He sees the lowest and most hidden things, as well as the celestial hosts, the καταχθόνιοι as well as the ἐπουράνιοι. It is *place*, therefore, rather than events, or descriptions of things contained, that is mainly thought of. On this account, the adverb *where* is not a superfluity in the translation, but a necessary link in the association of thought. The "giant shades" represent the world they inhabit, and all the more impressively from the sudden way in which Job mentions them after his brief reproof of Bildad's declamation. This is the view of MEDE as givon in POOLE'S *Synopsis: Locus ubi* antiqui gigantes lugent sub aquis; infernus et locus perditionis patet oculis Dei. He compares it with Prov. xv. 11: "*Sheol* and *Abaddon* are before the Lord." In both passages *Abaddon* is the deeper, the darker, the more returnless place. It is the *Locus Perditionis*, the world of *the lost*. As thus designating place generally (the world below and the world lowest of all), it leaves a secondary question how far this is mythical, legendary, so regarded by the speakers themselves, or to what extent it was actually believed. It may be used as Paul uses καταχθόνιοι Phil. ii. 10: "things or beings below the earth," in distinction from those above, without our supposing in him a knowledge of the Antipodes, or of an actual world below. It is used to denote the great depths and their possible inhabitants, in distinction from the visible things in the heavens, or as a comprehensive mode of denoting all beings "above the earth, and on the earth, and under the earth."

The word רְפָאִים is undoubtedly used for *manes, umbræ*, the *shades*, supposed to inhabit the under-world. This comes directly from the primary sense of *weakness* in רפא when used for רפה. The רפאים, the *weak*, the *powerless*. It immediately suggests Homer's κάμοντες as applied to the dead, the *wearied*, or εἴδωλα καμόντων, the *images, umbræ*, or shades of the deceased. For a similar use of this word in Hebrew see Isaiah xiv. 10; xxvi. 14, 19; Ps. lxxxviii. 11; Prov. ii. 18; ix. 18; xxi. 16. What makes a seeming difficulty, however, is the fact that the same term is used for a race of giants, as in Gen. xiv. 5; xv. 20; Isa. xvii. 5. This naming may have come from some law of contrary association, such as frequently influences language. They were called the *feeble* very much as the Greek called the Furies Ευμενίδες, the *kindly* ones, the *gracious* powers. Here, in fact, the true force of the passage is best given by combining the two ideas: the once mighty men of old now feeble, wailing ghosts. Such a tradition of mighty rebellious powers engaged in a contest with heaven, defeated and cast down, was certainly in the world, and in the most ancient mythologies.

The question may arise, whether it is to be regarded as referring to the old antediluvian giants (the "men of renown" mentioned Gen. vi.), or to some such war with the higher powers as is shadowed in the Greek fables of the conflict between the gods and the giants, or the gods and the Titans, the latter the helpers of Kronos when dethroned by Zeus, and hurled down beneath the waters of the abyss, as related in ÆSCH. *Prom. Vinct.* 219:

Ταρτάρου μελαμβαθὴς
Κευθμὼν καλύπτει τὸν παλαιγενῆ Κρόνον
Αὐτοῖσι συμμάχοισι:

The deep black pit of Tartarus that hides
The old-born Kronos with his helping hosts.

Compare 2 Peter ii. 4: "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, (*ταρταρώσας*, a word taken from this Greek mythical language), and delivered them unto chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." The New Testament writings (Jude 6, 2; 2 Pet. ii. 4, and passages in the Revelations) show that the idea of such a conflict existed before the birth of our Saviour, and might be called universal in the world, Jewish as well as heathen—going back, perhaps, if we may judge from the manner of those Apostles speaking of it, and quoting old authorities, to a most remote antiquity. Some great event of the kind, whether regarded as having taken place in the heavenly or in the earthly sphere, seems to have made a deep impression upon the primitive mind in whatever way it was revealed or traditionally transmitted. Hence all early mythology is so full of it, however monstrous and grotesque the forms it has assumed. The Bible has the least to say about it; but the few indications it does give are, on that very account, the more fearful in their character: "The giants groan beneath the waters"—"delivered unto chains of darkness"—"reserved unto the judgment." There is nothing in the Hesiodean and Homeric Tartarus, or in the stories of Tityus, Sisyphus, and Tantalus, or in the corresponding horrors of Indian and Scandinavian myths, to be compared with this veiled language of perdition and despair. In this passage the Rephaim, or giant shades, are represented as suffering extreme anguish (יחוללו, *writhing, torture, travail*), and this shows that the reference to them is that of a special case, as of some awful example, and not to the shades generally, who are described as quiescent, inert, rather than as suffering.

In the rendering "deep Abaddon," ver. 6, the epithet is justified by the evidently intended contrast. Abaddon is lower than Sheol, or the underworld. Or if included in the latter term, it is its deepest department, and, in every respect, a more mysterious conception. They are not tautologies. Abaddon seems to bear something of the same relation to Sheol that Tartarus, in Homer, bears to Hades. Compare the Iliad viii. 13:

ἐς Τάρταρον ἠερόεντα,
Τῆλε μάλ', ἧχι βάθιστον ὑπὸ χθονός ἐστι βέρεθρον·
Τόσσον ἔνερθ' Ἀΐδεω ὅσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπό γαίης:

——Down to rayless Tartarus,
Deep, deep, in the great Gulf below the earth,—
As far beneath the Shades as earth from heaven.
—BRYANT.

DELITZSCH says that Abaddon alternates with קֶבֶר, the grave, and cites Ps. lxxxviii. 12. So in Job xxviii. 22 it is mentioned in connection with מות; just as Death and Hades are mentioned together Rev. i. 18; xx. 14. In the latter place, too, they are both represented, after Hades has given up the souls of the righteous, as being cast into that deeper place, "the lake of fire." But in Ps. lxxxviii. 12 the word is used as denoting, generally, all after death, or the most extreme world of death, if we may regard it as synonymous with the expression בְּבוֹר תַּחְתִּיּוֹת, *in lacu inferno* of ver. 7 just above. It should be borne in mind, however, that there (Ps. lxxxviii. 12) the terms are taken metaphorically, to express the extremes of darkness and misery. Here, and in Prov. xv. 11 (as used in both cases with Sheol), it evidently makes a climax. The parallelism demands that it be taken as some-

thing beyond Sheol, deeper, darker, more hidden and mysterious, yet still open to the all-seeing eye. Comp. Ps. cxxxix. 8. So also in Deut. xxxii. 22, there appears this idea of a deeper underworld than Sheol, or of a deeper department of it, as it were, "beneath that lowest deep a deeper still:" "For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn עַד שְׁאוֹל תַּחְתִּיּוֹת, to the lowest hell," LXX. ἕως Ἅιδου κατωτάτου. It may be said, that this is merely imagery; but what did it all come from? In Job xxxi. 12 this word is again taken figuratively to denote the deepest destruction: "It would be like a fire (the sin of adultery there mentioned) that would consume even to Abaddon" (comp. Prov. v. 8). It was the moral feeling that carried the imaginations of Jews and Greeks in both directions, *up* and *down*. The world must be as *deep* as it is *high*. So the Greeks had their spheres above spheres, even to the Empyrean, whilst, in the other direction, the idea of Hades was not complete unless Tartarus was placed beneath it. In like manner, the Hebrew mind had its "heavens" in the plural (Gen. i. 1), then its "heaven of heavens," and its third heavens (the Rabbins afterwards made them *fifty*). The complement of the idea was needed. *Up* and *down* are, indeed, relative terms, and so thinking men, from Solomon to Aristotle and Newton, have ever regarded them. But the ideas they typify are real. It is felt that there must be in the great system of things a *profundity* corresponding to the *altitude*, an evil to the good, a darkness, a risk, and a loss, forming a counterpart to the light, the hope, and the glory. This carried the mind in the opposite direction, first to the grave, then to Sheol, then to Abaddon or the *lacus infernus*, בּוֹר תַּחְתִּיּוֹת, below all. There can be no doubt that from this came much of the imagery of the Revelation. In that book (chap. ix. 11), the name Abaddon is given to the Power of the place, rather than to the place itself; it makes it the King of the Abyss, βασιλέα τῆς ἀβύσσου; whence he is also called Ἀπολλύων (Apollyon) the Destroyer; but it is the same idea and the same destruction.

Even in the Old Testament, as may be learned from passages in Job and the Psalms, there was connected with Sheol some idea of deliverance: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades;" but Abaddon was *total perdition*: "the way of the wicked (Ps. i. 6) shall *perish*," תֹּאבֵד; that is, it leads to *Abaddon*, the world of irrecoverable ruin. As is argued in the INTROD. THEISM, pa. 13, there is, in the Old Testament, a veil cast over the whole idea of existence after death, or over Sheol itself. Still more dense is the covering that enshrouds Abaddon; but even in the Old Scriptures there are, now and then, glimpses of the remoter fearful ruin, too frequently passed over as merely metaphorical. So in the Greek mythology there are cases of return from Hades, however rare and exceptional, but from Tartarus there was no deliverance; the lost were there *forever*, τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον (see PLATO, *Rep.* 615, B. *Gorg.* 525 c). So far, however, as the Scriptures, whether Old or New, give us glimpses of this awful state, it is not one of extinction or annihilation. The figures all point the other way to the idea of existence in *perdition*. It is ἀπώλεια, *utter destruction*. It is the world of the *perished*, of the *lost* (*perditorum*). In a word it is אֲבַדּוֹן, an existence still having place and state, but one of total and irretrievable disorganization.

In verse 7, Job comes back from Hades and Abaddon to the earth and the mundus above. By the North is primarily indicated the north pole of the heavens which seems lifted up and impending over emptiness. *Over* nothing; improperly rendered, *upon* nothing; עַל בְּלִימָה, *upon not anything;* בלי and מה, as מה and מה in מאומה, *anything whatever.* It immediately suggests the description of OVID, *Met.* i. 11:

Pendens in aere tellus
Ponderibus librata suis.

No wonder need be felt at this language of Job, as though expressing an idea peculiarly modern. No thoughtful mind could ever contemplate the sun's setting in the evening West, and its rising, a few hours after, in the morning East, without the thought of its having gone under the Earth, or of the Earth's having turned over. Even this latter view was more ancient than the days of Pythagoras, who had the Copernican idea of the solar system, derived as is supposed, from the Egyptians, or the East. See Note on Ecclesiastes i. 5 and Ps. xix. 6 (LANGE *Com.*, Vol. x., p. 38), where the sun is represented as "*panting*" up "the

eastern steep." From this there must have been the conception of an underside, at least, to the earth, or of a body lying in space, with space all around it. ZÖCKLER says: "We must not think of a ball, but of a circular plate or disk;" but he has no authority for saying this. The Latin *orbis terrarum* is a very different idea, and has a different origin from the appearance of the visible horizon. Once depart from the notion of an indefinitely extended plane, or conceive of a body lying in space, and there is immediately suggested the spherical figure, or something like it. This is not only because it is easiest in its conception (the Scheibe of ZÖCKLER, a flat plate figure, wabbling in space, being difficult as well as incongruous), but because it is, theoretically, the most perfect figure for the mind's contemplation, as ARISTOTLE reasons in his very clear and conclusive argument (*Book, De Cœlo,* lib. ii. 13, 14) for the sphericity of the Earth, made long before the days of COLUMBUS. The same thinking has led some, in modern times, to the idea of a spherical Universe. We need not, moreover, give ourselves any difficulty about the apparent inconsistency between this more correct view and the merely phenomenal one, ver. 10, or what is said about the "pillars of the earth," Job ix. 6, or attempt to explain it, as Zöckler does, by making *pillars* mean something inside the Earth, as its bones or skeleton. In ancient, as well as in modern, times, the poetical or phenomenal conception existed side by side with the more contemplative idea,—if the latter is not, indeed, the more poetical of the two when held without its prosaic arithmetic. BYRON speaks of the "sun setting on the wide, wide sea," just as HOMER does. Neither is there any occasion here to talk about the absurdity of some ancient ideas in respect to the Earth's support, such as that presented in the old worn-out lecturer's stories of the Earth on the elephant, and the elephant on the tortoise. Men who say that *Gravitation* supports the Earth—going no further than the name, or its mathematical calculus—are guilty of an equal absurdity; or rather, all the worse, we might say, for the seriousness of its pretension, whereas the old explanations referred to have something of a jocular air about them. RASCHI gives us a grand idea here. The support of the world, he says, is חזוק זרועותיו של הקב״ה, "the strength of the arms of the Holy One, blessed be He." The reference is to Deut xxxiii. 27, מִתַּחַת זְרֹעֹת עוֹלָם, "*underneath are the everlasting arms,*" or the "arms of Olam," the "arms of the world," the arms that hold up the world, whether it be the *world in space* or the *world in time* (*Olamic, æonian*). RABBI LEVI BEN GERSON explains it metaphysically: בְּלִימָה, he says, "is the centre of the earth, called nothing, because it is *nothing in itself,* being only a *point in position,* and yet the supporting and supported point of the whole." In the next verse, there is the same essential mystery as in the suspended earth: the waters in the cloud maintaining their equilibrium in the air.

Ver. 7. *The world.* So ארץ is best rendered here, as in Prov. viii. 31 (תֵּבֵל אַרְצוֹ), and in some other places, where it seems to be put for the visible mundus of which the Earth is the centre, or on which the sky is built (1 Sam. ii. 18). In Ps. xviii. 16, תֵּבֵל is used for the Earth, and so in Ps. xciii. 1, and some other places ("*the round world*" as the English Church Psalter renders it). The view connects itself with the visible celestial sphere, and thus the second clause is only an extension of the first: the North Pole over the void, or the whole *mundus* conceived as having the earth for its nucleus, and thus, as a whole, hanging over nothing. This would not be in conflict with the more limited view of the Earth as itself unsupported in space. It may be called the *tellurian* rather than the simply *terrestrial* idea, or than the *terraqueous* conception, the Earth lying upon the encircling waters, which DELITZSCH attaches to the idea.

EXCURSUS VII.

ON THE POSITIONS AND CONNECTIONS OF

CHS. XXVII., XXVIII., XXIX., XXX.

Chapter xxv. closes the speeches of the friends. In ch. xxvi. Job replies directly to Bildad. Ch. xxvii. begins what may be called his closing Vindication, which may be divided into six parts: 1st. Job's solemn oath by way of protest against the charges really or seemingly made: ch. xxvii. 1-11. 2d. His picture of the wicked man and his doom, xxvii. 11 to the end of the chapter. This may be regarded as a more careful statement of the case, and, to some extent, a retractation of former extravagant positions into which he had been driven by the criminations of his opponents, grounded, as they were, upon the opposite extreme (see Excursus II., page 7). 3d. A meditation on the unsearchableness of the divine wisdom as compared with the deepest discoveries of natural and human knowledge, ch. xxviii. It may be rightly called a *meditation*, or soliloquy, because it seems addressed to no one, and, taken by itself, would give little or no intimation of any other human presence. Such a character, too, might be given to it from its apparent lack of open logical connection with the chapter immediately preceding. Its emotional connection, however, it is not difficult to trace. More than any direct assertion would have been, is it an admission, by the one who thus soliloquizes, that he has been rash in his complaints of the divine procedure. He "has uttered what he understood not, things too wonderful for him that he knew not," as he afterwards more expressly confesses, xlii. 3. Its connection is also seen from its leading him, at the close of the chapter, to that submission in which he describes the highest wisdom of man to be "the fear of the Lord, and departure from evil." 4th. A touching reminiscence of his former prosperity and standing among men—most pathetic indeed, but free from any murmuring spirit, or any rebellious language, ch. xxix. 5th. A like impassioned representation of the contempt and neglect in which he is now held by the vile, and of the extreme misery of his condition, ch. xxx. There are here a few touches of the old feeling, but presented in an exquisitely natural way: "God is hard toward him" (ver. 21), "His hand is still against him;" but, in the main, the spirit of the sufferer is subdued, though exceedingly mournful, and never wholly lapses from that better tone which had come to it from the rapturous hope of the divine presence and reconciliation, xix. 25-27. 6th. A most eloquent assertion of his integrity, with a glowing recital of the deeds by which it had been manifested, and a most indignant denial of the charges made against him. Then Elihu speaks, whom we may suppose to have been present, with others probably, during the whole debate.

But the most remarkable among these six intervening chapters is the xxviii. The connection, too, between it and the others is the least easily traced. Chapter xxvi. had been a reply to Bildad in his own style. Chapter xxvii. was addressed, in a more general manner, to all three of the disputants; but here, in ch. xxviii., Job seems occupied almost wholly with his own thoughts. Chapters xxix., xxx. xxxi., again betray the presence of others to whom they seem to be addressed, and by a consciousness of which their mode of thought and utterance seems to be in a measure influenced. Here in ch. xxviii. the speaker seems to be all alone, so far as any outward indications are concerned, or to be talking only to himself and God. This justifies us in calling it a soliloquy, and in expecting, consequently, an emotional rather than a strictly logical connection. It drives us, also, to the supposition of an interval of silence between the last words of ch. xxvii., "Men shall hiss him out of his place" (or indeed, the whole picture presented in the latter portion of that chapter), and the כִּי which so startlingly commences the xxviiith.: "*For* there is a vein—yes, surely—there

is a vein for the silver," &c. We would be more struck with this if we always read the two parts continuously, or without that break which is made by the division into chapters. Such interval of silence may be of the briefest duration, and yet, as is elsewhere observed, the thoughts may have travelled far—always, however, controlled and guided by the underlying feeling which seems never to leave the mind of Job. He is ever brooding over the mystery of suffering innocence, rather than of the impunity or the punishment of the wicked—ideas wholly subordinate to it. With this mystery, a meditation on the unsearchable wisdom of God, such as this chapter is occupied with, stands in closest connection. We are surprised at finding DELITZSCH raising an objection to it on the ground, as he says, that "the chapter treats not so much of the wisdom of God as of the wisdom of men." It is so, apparently, and as far as mere *quantity* is concerned, but surely this is only preparatory to the great conclusion. From the very beginning, the other idea, with the ever underlying thought that leads to it, has been in the speaker's mind. The secrets of nature, and the human explorations of nature, are brought in, and dwelt upon at such length, only to impress more strongly on the mind the contrast presented by the deeper mystery,—only to make more startling the question: "Where, then, shall wisdom be found?" the great, the all-explaining wisdom. The mention of the silver in the beginning is only one of the illustrative facts or examples, having, in itself, no more to do with the connection of thought than "the iron," or "the stone of darkness," or the "bread that cometh out of the earth." It is altogether too slight, therefore, when Delitzsch would make the connection to consist in the mention of the *silver* here as suggested by the כסף, the bad man's *silver*, mentioned xxvii. 12; as though this had been retained in mind through all the following verses, and had suggested the deep train of thought which so distinguishes ch. xxviii. Only keep in view the peculiar character of Job's speeches, their soliloquizing tendency at all times, and this tendency now increased by the silence, or withdrawal, of the other speakers,—only keep this steadily in mind, and we have the explanation, as we diffidently think, in search of which so many commentators have taken so many different ways.

Why do the innocent suffer? It is ever on his mind. The question is a most difficult one, even when viewed in the fullest light afforded by the Gospel. In some of its aspects, it is absolutely appalling: Why do the innocent suffer? Not merely the virtuous *man*, so called, who is only comparatively righteous: why do children suffer? why do infants suffer? Or, admitting them to have a connection with the common depravity, and the common guilt, why do they suffer so severely? *more severely*, in some respects, than others; since no diseases are so painful, no deaths so agonizing, to appearance, as those that are sometimes endured when these young, vigorous, acutely-feeling human lives are quenched. The term is not too strong. It is, indeed, a most appalling mystery, at which science, so-called, should lay her hand upon her mouth, and confess her total ignorance, instead of the foolish, stammering talk in which she sometimes indulges about "natural laws," and certain dim, far-fetched utilitarian ends of pain—thereby only "darkening counsel by words without knowledge." What problem in nature is to be compared with the moral mystery of the dying infant—dying, agonizing, in the very presence of that science which has so much to say about the Kosmos, and knows so little about the human body with its deep springs of life and death!

Why do the innocent suffer? God only knows—as the old ante-Koranic Arabians were so accustomed to say. Why do I suffer so, says Job—suffer so much more than other men? The higher wisdom of God alone can solve the problem; and to this he turns from that picture of the wicked man which in itself presents so little mystery. The deepest things in nature, as viewed in the light of any science, modern as well as ancient, present only a step in this remoter inquiry: "But where shall wisdom be found, and where is this place of understanding?" "The eagle's eye (the personification of the keenest sense-intelligence) hath not seen it;" "the Deep saith it is not in me, the Sea saith it is not in me;" nature doth not reveal it. "It is not found in the land of the living;" history does not make it known; the search carries the mind beyond the present world of being; "Abaddon and Death say we have barely heard with our ears a rumor" of the mighty secret. "But God knoweth the way thereof." He who gave nature her decrees—"He who made a law for the rain, and

a way for the thunder's flash"—can alone look *through* nature, and *beyond* nature, to the remotest ends for which *she herself was ordained;* and it is He "who saith unto man that, *for him*, the fear of the Lord, *that* is wisdom, and to depart from evil (moral evil) *that*, for him, is understanding."

This is the train of thought that springs up at the commencement of ch xxviii., or during the brief silent interval, so charged with emotion, that precedes it. The unspoken link connects the two chapters more closely than any formal, logical, or grammatical bond, and the כי, which the silent thought suggests, is the transition note that takes us into the higher modulation: "Yes, so it is—yea, truly so it is:"—

For silver, there's a vein,
A place for gold which they refine.
The iron from the dust is brought,
And copper from the molten stone.
To (nature's) darkness (man) is setting bounds;
Unto its end he searcheth everything,—
The ore of darkness, where the death shade dwells.
But Wisdom! where shall it be found?

That wisdom of which man knows not "the place nor price," which "gold and pearls can never buy."

Why do we suffer so? To this deep cry of humanity nature returns no answer. God only knows. The acknowledgment of this is the highest human wisdom, as submission to it is the clearest human duty.

Among all the emendations proposed on account of the alleged want of connection between chap. xxviii. and chap. xxvii., as they stand, no one seems more plausible than that of PAREAU (*Commentatio De Immortalitatis ac Vitæ Futuræ Notitiis ab Antiquissimo Jobi Scriptore*, pp. 246-250). He would simply make the two chapters change places. In one aspect of the case, his reasoning might seem entitled to very serious consideration. As he says: "Any one who reads chap. xxviii. directly after chap. xxvi., must admit that there is a very natural and easy conjunction—sentiet ipse tantam esse in utroque et consilii et argumenti conjunctionem, ut nexus facilitas in oculos incurrat. What is said in chap. xxvi. about the greatness and mystery of the divine works, God's seeing into the Underworld, His glorious beauty in the heavens, and especially the closing thought that these "*things that are seen*" are but "the endings," the outstandings, "of His ways," leads most easily to the train of thought carried on in the first part of chap. xxviii., and to the transition thence to the unsearchableness of the divine wisdom. But then, again, after giving all due weight to this, we find immense difficulties in the other direction. In the *first* place, it is not easy to discover the nexus between chap. xxviii. and chap. xxvii. regarded as coming right after it. The calming, solemnizing, most sublime, yet tender meditation which closes the one, followed immediately, *in uno tenore*, or without any interval, by the oath and vehement, if not angry, protest which so mark the commencement of the other. Let a man read them continuously, uno tenore legat, as PAREAU says, and he cannot but feel that there is a want of harmony both in the thought and in the diction: "The fear of Adonai, man's only wisdom," and in the next breath a charging God with delay or denial of justice, if not an unjust decision in respect to the right of his cause. This cannot be. "Dramatic propriety," to say nothing of anything else, would demand that between two such declarations there should be some considerable interval of time, marked by the intervention of new trains of thought. In the *second* place, there is a still greater inharmoniousness between the latter part of the 27th and the beginning of the 29th, which, according to the proposed change, would immediately succeed it: The downfall of the rich wicked man, vividly and even exultingly drawn, and the touching picture of his own happiness in days that are past:

Ch. xxvii. 21.	**The east wind lifts him up, and he is gone;**
	A tempest steals him in the night away;
Ver. 22.	**God hurls his bolt against him;**

Ver. 23. Men clap their hands,
And hiss him from his place.
xxix. 1. O that I were as in the moons of old,
As in the days when God took care of me.

There may be no direct contradiction; but every reader must feel that that there is a sad discord in it when thus presented.

On the other hand, nothing would seem to be more natural, or more fitting, than the emotional transition from this closing meditation of the 28th, as it stands, and the pathetic wish that opens the 29th, although most likely with a brief interval between them. For there, too, is the inserted textual scholium: "And Job again resumed his parable;" resumption certainly implying some intervening silence. The train of thought, to one who enters into the emotion is unmistakable: "Man's wisdom is the fear of the Lord; to depart from evil is his understanding." It makes him think of his own case, of his own perfect submission to the Divine Wisdom, i. 21, and this not in a boastful or self-righteous way, but from a reminiscence which only a false or feigned humility would repel. "A man fearing God and departing from evil;"—just such a man he had aimed to be; just such a man God himself had twice described him as being (יְרֵא אֱלֹהִים וְסָר מֵרָע, i. 1, 8). The "fear of the Lord;" that had been his religious life; "*eschewing* evil," departing from evil, that had been his constant aim. How purely this appears in that touching practice of his described i. 5: his rising early in the morning, and offering prayers and sacrifices for his children, lest, peradventure, in their hours of joy, they may have forgotten God. "This did Job continually" (כָּל הַיָּמִים "all his days"). And now that they are all dead and gone, swept away by a providence utterly inexplicable—now that his house lies desolate (xvi. 7), his reverential fear of God, his love of God, as RASCHI says, continues still. At the end of this sublime meditation he again asserts it as man's highest wisdom, his highest duty. He feels that it is *his* wisdom, *his* duty, now, as in the days of his prosperity: "But O that it were with me as in the moons of old,"

When shone upon my head the lamp of God,
And through the darkness, by its light I walked.

For there had been shades even in that season of worldly happiness, as he himself intimates in the close of his opening lamentation:

I was not confident; I did not feel secure;
Nor did I careless rest; yet trouble came.

In the language of the 131st Psalm: "His heart had not been haughty, nor his eyes lofty; neither had he walked in ways too great or too wonderful for him."

The translator has made it his aim to adhere most strictly to the Hebrew text and order; but if any change could be admitted, it would not be in the text, properly, but in the transition scholia that divide the chapters. These can hardly be said to belong to the text in the same manner as the speeches themselves. They are like the titles to the Psalms, or the note at the end of chap. xxxi., תַּמּוּ דִּבְרֵי אִיּוֹב, "the words of Job are finished," such as are found at the closing portions of old manuscripts, like the FINIS in modern books. Compare the end of Psalm lxxii. These may have been the work of the original writer; but they have more the appearance of scholia added by later transcribers, though before the time of the ancient versions. In either view, there is an essential difference between them and the text strictly. It should be noted, however, that these scholia, as they appear before chap. xxvii. and xxix., have a peculiar word that is not found in the others: "Then Job resumed his *parable*, and said." In the Hebrew it is מָשָׁל, *mashal*. If we keep the rendering *parable*, it must be understood as having two senses. Parable, *παραβολή* (*παραβάλλω*), is a placing side by side. The two things thus placed may be an outward allegorical fiction and the inner sense it represents. Or the figure may be wholly outward, referring, as it does here, to the style of the diction—a placing side by side two sentences similarly constructed and expressing similarity of idea. Thus regarded, the parable, or mashal (Latin *similis*) is synonymous with *parallelism*, that is the speaking or *chanting* in couplets. That it really was a kind of

chanting, appears not only from the musical notes in the Psalms, but from the peculiar word here connected with it: "Job added" (resumed), שְׂאֵת מְשָׁלוֹ, "to *lift up*" (not simply take up) "his parable." It was the lifting up the voice after a pause, and going on in the chanting measured movement, as *Selah* (סֶלָה, a letting down, a pause, or silence) denoted the contrary proceeding. On the naturalness and facility of this in ancient times, and in the eastern world (notwithstanding its seeming strangeness to us), see remarks in the INTRODUCTION, or Argument on the THEISM of the Book, pp. 41, 42.

There would seem to be a propriety in having such a scholium of resumption, with its implied preceding pause, at the beginning of chap. xxviii., rather than of chap. xxvii.; but a better way would be to regard it as coming in both places, as it occurs also at the commencement of chap. xxix.; and so the translator has ventured to give it. It should be noted, however, that these two scholia (chaps. xxvii. and xxix.) are peculiar in having this word *mashal* (*lifting up his mashal*), as also from their occurrence, in this way, in the long talk of Job (xxvi.—xxxi.). It is after the others have ceased to respond, and when he goes on by himself, hardly seeming to heed their presence—being occupied, as it were, with his own deeper thoughts and deeper experience. Elsewhere they mark the close of particular speeches and the commencement of a reply. The fact noticed may be claimed as strongly confirming what the translator has said in other places about such soliloquizing pauses, and as showing that they were in the mind of the earliest writer, or, at least, of the earliest transcribers.

EXCURSUS VIII.

ON THE REFERENCES TO MINING OPERATIONS IN CERTAIN VERSES OF JOB XXVIII., AND ESPECIALLY THE DIFFICULTIES OF VERSES 4TH and 5TH.

An immense amount of commentary has been written on these passages, and especially ver. 4, which SCHULTENS at first described as "Cimmerian darkness," though afterwards he seems to have got more light upon it, which has been much used by others since his time. The ancient versions, LXX. and VULGATE, give us little or no help. The Syriac is more to be trusted; but the text there seems to be corrupt, as is apt to be the case with transcriptions of difficult passages. The old commentators, as given in POOLE'S SYNOPSIS of the *Critica Sacra*, seem to present irreconcilable variances. The later commentators, since the days of SCHULTENS, agree in referring it to mining operations, in which they are undoubtedly right, as may be inferred, in a general way, from the first three verses, together with the 9th and 11th. The error, however, into which some have fallen, seems to consist in the minuteness of description they profess to find. SCHULTENS, we think, first gave to דַּלּוּ the rendering *swings suspended*, that is, *in the shaft* of the mine. It has a pretty good foundation etymologically. It is picturesque, moreover, and that made it at once a favorite. Later commentators have generally adopted it. It is, however, by no means certain. Not suspension generally, like תלה, but a vacillating, tottering motion, from side to side, seems to be the primary meaning of דלל, and the one which most readily explains its other applications. With this, however, *suspension* easily connects itself, and there mingle with it also certain senses derived from דלה (to draw, as from a well by letting down a bucket), which increase the resemblance. There is, however, no clear example of this sense of *suspension*, unless the present case is one. In Ps. cxvi. 6, דַּלּוֹתִי is much better rendered: "*I was weak* (*wavering, tottering, halting*), and He saved me," or I was *relaxed*. So in Prov. xxvi. 7, rendered by some, "the legs of the lame hang down" (GES. *crura dependent*), there is much rather the

sense of *weakness, vacillation, tottering,* and the thing compared to this (in the second clause), namely, "a proverb in the mouth of a fool," well preserves its adaptedness: it (the proverb) has no force or *steadiness* in such a mouth. This, too, it should be noted, is nearer the form of דלה, though GESENIUS tries to make it from דלל (דַּלְיוּ for דָּלְלוּ). In Isaiah xix. 6, the full form of the word we have here is used of streams, and joined with חָרְבוּ (*are dried up*): דָּלְלוּ וְחָרְבוּ יְאֹרֵי מָצוֹר. This suggests for the first verb the sense of *diminution,* or of weakness (*languida sunt,* GES.); but it may, nevertheless, keep the primary meaning of *deviation, vacillation.* They present the phenomena of streams, or wadies, nearly dried up, with here and there a varying of the shallow channel, a running in *devious* ways, instead of the strong, direct flowing of a full river. Compare יְלַפְּתוּ, Job v. 18. The derivative meaning of דֶּלֶת, *door* (*valva*) is clearly from the *swaying sense* without including that of suspension. So, too, the Arabic *dalla* has no such sense of suspension as DELITZSCH ascribes to it. The derivative, *daldal,* is used to denote a vacillating motion, or swaying from side to side; but this comes from a sort of onomatopic analogy, such as may be recognized in our words *dally* and *dalliance.* The Arabic *dala* has the same meaning with the Hebrew דלה, *to draw water by letting down a bucket.* This might do here if we suppose דלל to borrow its meaning from it, as is not unfrequently the case with verbs similarly related. And thus we have rendered it generally in this place, *swing themselves down,* or "*let themselves down,*" without that forced idea of a narrow mining shaft, the great objection to which is, that it compels the forcing of other very familiar Hebrew words. It might denote a *swinging from the rocks* of their wild way, or from one precipice to another by means of ropes.* The word נוע carries on the same general idea of *wandering, roaming* (see such passages as Am. iv. 8; viii. 12; Jer. xiv. 10; Lam. iv. 15), and seems almost synonymous with נדד or נוד, denoting uniformly a moving from place to place. In Judges ix. 9, 11 (fable of Jotham), it seems to denote the swaying of the branches of trees; though the context would rather demand for it the sense of *ruling,* like *sway* in English (to *bend,* transitive or intransitive), or from some other analogy. It can hardly have there (Judg. ix.) this image of waving branches, since it is used of the vine as well as of the lofty, *swaying* trees. In neither respect, however, would it be suitable to this idea of a mining shaft, whilst in the other, or roaming sense, so common, and almost universal, it would present a striking incongruity. In that case, too, גָּר and אֱנוֹשׁ would refer simply to the men above in their relation to the others regarded as below them in the shaft; a distinction, as it would seem, too narrow for terms so wide. It would be extravagant as applied to a separation so brief in time, and so short in space; whilst it would take away from that picture of remoteness and of solitary wandering which the whole contour of the passage seems to present. Even as regards our extensive modern minings it would be a gross hyperbole.

It has been admitted that, in itself, this sense of suspension given to דַּלּוּ is not only picturesque, but seems to be possessed of a fair etymological ground. The objections arise from the context. Strongest among these is the necessity such a rendering creates of giving exceedingly forced senses, apparently—very unusual senses at least—to very plain and very common Hebrew words. It compels us to depart from that simple literal usage which, in such places as this, not unfrequently furnishes the best clue to the idea. We get the thought of something out of the way, and that leads us to overlook the plain sense of words as not adapted to it. So here, this pictorial fancy of suspension once entertained, there must be got for נַחַל the sense of *shaft*—a perpendicular or, sometimes, a horizontal hole dug or *cut in* the earth. It might be said, that the verb פרץ, taken transitively, is not well adapted to such an operation, meaning, as it generally does, a sudden *bursting* rupture or *breaking.*

* This would seem to be the real meaning of Pliny, H. N. xxxiii. 4, 21, though quoted by ZÖCKLER and DELITZSCH in favor of the shaft-idea: Is qui cædit funibus pendet, ut *procul intuenti* species ne ferarum quidem sed alitum fiat. Pendentes majori ex parte librant et *lineas itineri præducunt.* The words in Italics, especially, give this idea of swinging from lofty rocks or precipices, and thus carrying on the lines of their farther progress; so that to the *spectator at a distance* they look like birds in the air. It is all inconsistent with the idea of persons descending in a narrow hole, or shaft, by means of a windlass. It suggests rather the idea of scouts, explorers, and the language of Job is in perfect harmony with the same conception.

But waiving that consideration, there is no hazard in saying, that of such a sense for נַחַל not the least trace can be found in any use of the word in any passage of the Hebrew Scriptures, although it occurs more than a hundred times. It is a remarkably clear word, and its application to localities well known and visible such as the *nahal* Kedron, the brook or torrent Kedron, the *nahal* Kishon (*nahal kedhumim*, "that ancient river Kishon"), can leave no doubt in respect to its exact meaning. It is a valley, a ravine, or wady, with a torrent running through it which is often dried up, leaving the valley itself as chiefly represented by the word. See its frequent use in connection with proper names of such places: Nahal Eshcol, Nahal Arnon, Nahal Jabbok, *etc.* The mere fact of such marked geographical uses would have prevented its being applied to a thing so different as the perpendicular shaft of a mine. DELITZSCH seems to feel this when he suggests the treatment of it here as a different word, with a different etymology: נַחַל from חלל, *to bore*, like חָלִיל, a *pipe* or flute; but this would be unexampled among Hebrew derivations, whilst it has no support whatever in any Arabic word or usage. It is the same necessity of accommodation to the intruded idea that compels a departure from the usual sense of גָּר before alluded to, and which, in its participle sense of temporary dweller or sojourner, does not differ from the other form, גֵּר, pilgrim or traveller. There is, too, the preposition מֵעִם in its double or intensive form (*from, with*), denoting a departure *from* the accustomed or the familiar, the traveler's common track, *into* the wild and the unknown—

Where breaks the valley from the pilgrim's view,

or from the dweller's knowledge, whichever rendering we may give to it (see foot-note, Job xxviii. 4). The whole style of the language favors this mode of viewing it: *forgotten of the foot;** רֶגֶל being used for the *foot-worn* way to which *these* wanderers (הנשכחים with the article) may be said *to be lost*, or which, as this most poetical diction presents it, has forgotten them. It is almost the language of ÆSCHYLUS, *Prom.* Vinct: far removed, ἄβατον εἰς ἐρημίαν *to an untrodden wild*—away from the haunts of man, ἀπάνθρωπος (ver. 20), an almost verbal translation of the Hebrew מֵאֱנוֹשׁ. It is the same feeling that is created by the description of the Greek poet. There is about it all an air of solitariness and remoteness, inconsistent with any idea we can form of the shaft of a mine which is generally a well known and much frequented place.

In ver. 5, there is the same general idea of the human inquisitiveness to which all else in this part of the chapter is subservient. It may refer to mining operations, or to a search for precious stones in caverns, or deep places of the earth, supposed to lie near the subterranean fires, and of which certain precious stones and metals were regarded, in some way, as the product. Here, also, a too narrow view, which would confine it to the first class of works, seems to have caused violence to the language of the passage, especially in the second clause. The הוּא חוֹקֵר of ver. 3, implied, as it is, all through ver. 4, is to be supplied in this: "*He searches out*," or men search out:

Earth's surface (they explore) whence comes forth bread,—
Its depths below, where it seems turned to fire.

Its upper and lower regions are both the scenes of the human search for wealth or knowledge. All else in the language is used to express a contrast which does not seem to have been sufficiently attended to. It is that which is supposed to exist between the products of the two regions—*bread* above and *fire* below, or rather something of the nature of fire, כְּמוֹ אֵשׁ, something *fire-like*, *igneous*, *pyritic*, pyrogenous, πυροειδὴς; this being the nearest way by which the Hebrew language could express what in Greek would be denoted by the qualifying ter-

* Those who adopt the idea of the *shaft* have two ways of interpreting מִנִּי רָגֶל. One refers it to the fact that they are no longer supported in the usual way, *by the foot*, but held up by the rope. The other would regard it as denoting that they are *beneath the foot* of the person above, at the opening of the shaft, the גָּר, or *remainer*, so called because he *stays behind*. A much easier clue to the meaning is obtained from its resemblance to the familiar Greek phrase, ἐκ ποδῶν, to denote one who is *out of the way*, *far off*. When in the singular, ἐκ ποδός, as in PINDAR, *Nem.* vii. 99, it becomes identical with it.

mination *ειδής** attached to words. It makes quite a difference whether we take the particle כְּמוֹ, in this case, as qualifying the noun אֵשׁ, or the verb נֶהְפַּךְ: *something like fire*, which the speaker could describe in no other way, or *turned up like fire*, or as *by fire*, according to the view of some. כְּמוֹ may, indeed, be merely a particle of comparison when the context so demands: but here everything points the other way. It is the fire itself which is qualified: *fire as it were;* and so our English translators took it, though they seem to have expressed very obscurely whatever idea about it they may have had in their minds.

In this view of כמו אש, it becomes very important to determine the force and relation of the verb נהפך. Does it denote some operation of the supposed miners, their *turning up* the bowels of the earth like fire (that is, *as fire is turned*, though that seems to give hardly any sense), or does it mean turning them up *by means* of fire? The objection to the latter view is grammatical. It would demand a preposition with אֵשׁ, or an established ellipsis of one. Such an ellipsis of ב does indeed occur in connection with words of *time* and *place*, as is common in language; but when it is wanted to denote instrument or means, it is met with only in peculiar cases, where the context is such as to allow no possible doubt, or where the instrument is identical with the verb in nature and in action: As, "They *stoned* him *stones*" (Lev. xxiv. 23), or, "David was *girded* a linen *girdle*" (2 Sam. vi. 14); or, "They *sowed* the city *salt*" (Judg. ix. 45). In such cases, it resembles, somewhat, the Greek idiom giving a bare accusative of the garment or sword after verbs of clothing or armor. So, too, *words* uttered, or *sounds*, may be treated as instruments without a preposition; as, "He cried a great cry" (Ezek. xi. 13), instead of, *with a great cry*. See other cases presented by Noldius, and involving the same principle. Such an expression, however, as *turned up fire*, meaning, turned up *by fire*, is wholly unexampled. So great has seemed this difficulty, that some would solve it by a different reading, בְּמוֹ instead of כְּמוֹ. Some who adopt this view of fire as *the instrument*, though with so little warrant, carry it out to the most minute details. It is fire as used in smelting, or for breaking rocks *igne et aceto*, as ROSENMUELLER holds. So CASTALIO (quoted by ROSENMUELLER): Agunt per magna spatia cuniculos, et terram subeunt, *non secus ac ignis facit, ut in Ætna et Vesuvio.* DELITZSCH makes it "a turning and a tossing up of the earth *as by fire;*" and all this without any preposition, which is all the more demanded on account of the כמו, if the latter denotes a comparison of action having relation to the verb, instead of being qualificative of אש ("turned up," כבאש, or כמו באש).

A strong argument against this, aside from the others that have been mentioned, is derived from the nature of the verb הפך. A careful examination will show that the Niphal here, instead of denoting any action of miners, or of men in any way, simply expresses the contrariety between the two things mentioned, namely *bread* as the product of the surface, and the fire, or the igneous substances, the *quasi fire* (כמו אש) that reveals itself, or its effects, in the depths below. To make this clear, there is need of adverting to a few preliminary facts. Such an idea of fire in the earth is not a product of modern science only. There are many reasons for regarding it as a very ancient notion. The appearance of volcanoes, whether in action or quiescent, must have early given rise to it; and we know, from modern explorations, that there must have been such in those regions of the world, even though Scripture, and other history, had been perfectly silent about it. But there are notices of it in the Bible. Sinai was probably a volcanic mountain, and it would be no derogation from the wonder of the Sinaitic lawgiving that God had chosen it on that very account. That similar phenomena were not unknown in Judea and Arabia, is evident from such passages as Psalm civ. 32: "He but looks at the earth and it trembles; He *toucheth* the mountains and they *smoke*." Hence the old idea of subterranean rivers of fire, to which there may have been allusion in the נַחֲלֵי בְלִיַּעַל, *rivers of Belial* (*torrentes inferni*) of Ps. xviii. 5, the טִיט הַיָּוֵן and the בּוֹר שָׁאוֹן, the "*pit of noise*," or the *roaring pit*, of Ps. xl. 3, the יְוֵן מְצוּלָה, or "*boiling mud*" of Ps. lxix. 3, all of them, indeed, used metaphorically, but presenting primary ideas suggesting something very like the imagery by which Socrates, in the Phædo,

* From εἶδος, *species*, *kind* (*a kind of fire*, to use an expressive vulgarism), like the Hebrew מִין. It may mean *force of fire*, or *fiery force;* as Cicero says, *omnia ad igneam* vim referent, or as Pliny viii. 38, 57, speaks of the "fiery color of gems."

111, D, describes the subterranean regions: ἀεννάων ποταμῶν ἀμήχανα μεγέθη ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν, καὶ θερμῶν ὑδάτων, πολὺ δὲ πῦρ, καὶ πυρὸς μεγάλους ποταμούς, πολλοὺς δὲ ὑγροῦ πηλοῦ βορβορωδεστέρου: "immense magnitudes of ever-flowing rivers beneath the earth, and of boiling waters (כור שאון, *the crater of noise*, or the hollow resounding crater), and of vast fire, and of great rivers of fire, and many rivers of flowing mud boiling with turbulence." We cannot keep out of our minds "the horrible pit and the miry clay," by which the Scripture may be supposed to represent this awful conception of subterranean fire, and of boiling floods, with which it is mingled. There were volcanoes in the Arabian peninsula; the land of Idumea presents the strongest evidence of old eruptions, and they may have suggested to Job, or the author of Job, the same ideas that Ætna gave to Æschylus:

> ἔνθεν ἐκραγήσονταί ποτε
> Ποταμοὶ πυρὸς δάπτοντες ἀγρίαις γνάθοις,
> τῆς καλλικάρπου Σικελίας λευρὰς γύας.

There is then a double contrast here: 1st, between the upper surface of the earth, called simply ארץ, and the earth below, תחתיה; 2d, between the productions of the surface, of which the bread is the general representative, and the fire, or quasi fire, which seems to affect the nature of things below, showing itself not only in the striking outward phenomena referred to, but in the subterranean productions, metals, precious stones, sapphires, *etc.*, supposed to have in them more or less of the *fire-like* or *pyrogenous* element.* One class of things *is turned* into the other, the process being conceived in either way, or in both ways. For the expression of such a contrast and such a transformation, there is no word in Hebrew, or in any other language, better adapted than this verb הפך. The primary idea of this root, and one which it never loses, is that of *reversal*, *metamorphosis*, *transformation*. As a word of action, or motion, simply, it is the turning of a thing upside down, or completely *reversing* its position; as Hosea vii. 8, *the turning of a cake* as it is baked in the fire, 2 Kings xxi. 13, the *turning over a dish* when it is wiped. In this sense, it is applied figuratively to the complete overturning (καταστροφή) of Sodom and Gomorrah, to which there is such frequent reference in the Bible. As denoting *change*, it expresses a complete reversal of condition, in which sense it is more completely and more literally applicable to this notable case of Sodom and Gomorrah than in the first. It was not only a subversion locally, but the bringing into a state the direct opposite of the former, so that land becomes water, fertility barrenness and salt, fragrance and freshness a vile and loathsome putridity (see Note on the Destruction of the Cities of the Plain. LANGE, Gen., p. 443). This is the real force of that oft-used noun מַהְפֵּכָה as so repeatedly applied to this event. So that it becomes a kind of proper name, and passes traditionally into the Arabic mention of the *catastrophe*, occurring frequently in the Koran (see the note aforesaid). These cities are called the overturned, *Mow-ta-fe-kat*, VIII. Conj. Participle of the root אפך, which is the same with the Hebrew הפך. What is worthy of note is that in Arabic this is the only application of the word in which the archaic sense is retained. In other cases, it has the idea of falsehood and lying, which, though not found in the Hebrew, except a bare trace of it Prov. xvii. 20, is common in the Arabic אפך, and comes most naturally from this same old primary idea of *reversal* or *contrariety*, only changed from action to speech. It is the saying of that which is just the *contrary* of what *is*. From this idea of *reversal* comes another, or third usage of the word which occurs in many places, and seems to give the true meaning here. It is, as has been said, that of *transforma-*

* The action of fire, or the pyrogenous nature of substances found in the earth, and especially in the neighborhood of volcanoes, is unmistakable. Says Prof. PERKINS, of Union College, a most reliable authority on these matters, "All of the precious stones (proper), such as the sapphire, diamond, ruby, *etc.*, have most probably, at one time, been in a melted state. So gold, silver, copper, in many instances, are found in such a state as to indicate that they have not only been melted, but heated to such a temperature that they have been vaporized and deposited in the fissures of the rocks." Again he says: "In the lava from volcanoes, when it is cooled, bright crystals are found in little cavities, resembling, in their physical properties, crystals found in the rocks far away from volcanoes, and which, in the memory of man, have not been in an active state."

Science arranges such facts, and draws its conclusions from them; but the appearances struck the contemplative mind in ancient times, and, besides direct notices, there is much in language, and especially in the names for gems and metallic substances, that indicates the same early observation.

tion, metamorphosis, or of one thing turning into another. In none of these uses can it be employed as some would translate, that is, for digging up the earth, tossing it to and fro, as DELITZSCH says, or splitting rocks with fire and vinegar. When regarded in this last sense, it is totally inapplicable to any such idea. This sense of transformation has many examples; as Lev. xiii. 3: *the hair* (of the leper) *turned white*, with many following examples; Exod. vii. 15: *rod turned to a serpent;* Exod. viii. 20: *water turned to blood;* Ps. cv. 26, the same; Ps. cv. 25, *heart turned to hate;* Ps. cxiv., *rock turned to pool of water;* Isaiah xxxiv. 9, *valleys turned to pitch;* Joel iii. 14, *sun turned to darkness;* Job xix. 19, *friends turned to enemies*, though there it may have the local sense: are turned away (their faces) at the shocking sight of the sufferer. For other examples, see Amos v. 8, *morning to shadow of death;* Ps. lxvi. 6, *sea to dry land;* Ps. xxxii. 4, *my moisture to the summer drouth;* with other places in all of which it will be seen that there is the idea of a transformation to something of a different, and, in general, of a seemingly opposite nature. In such cases, the Niphal is equally used with the Kal, just as in English the transitive sense, *turns into*, and the passive, *is turned into*, have the same meaning. Or they might all be rendered, in English, without a preposition: *rod turned serpent, water turned blood, etc.*

Besides its own inherent fitness, the difficulties in the other translations seem to drive us to this sense of transformation, so well established in so many other cases. Taking the other view, as presented by DELITZSCH and ROSENMUELLER, the subject of נֶהְפַּךְ would seem to be אֶרֶץ; but there the gender is in the way. If we take תַּחְתֶּיהָ for the subject, there is a similar difficulty with the number; not insurmountable, indeed, as it may be taken collectively for the interior of the earth. The impersonal rendering, ***it turns***, or *there is a turning*, would do, but it suits the sense of transformation rather than that of a turning up by the miners. All grammatical difficulties are obviated by taking for the subject לֶחֶם (bread or food) in the first clause, just as it is joined to this same verb, and in this same sense of transformation, xx. 14: לַחְמוֹ בְּמֵעָיו נֶהְפָּךְ, *his bread in his bowels is turned*, changed, transformed to something else, becoming *the poison of asps*, as appears in the second clause. So here לחם נהפך כמו אש, *bread is turned to fire*, or to the כמו אש, the *fire-like* (*igneous*,* *πυροειδές*); bread and fire being taken as contraries, or, at least, very different *forms* of matter. The idea being somewhat strange, or out of the usual way, this mode of expression is adopted: *as it were* fire, as though this subterranean fiery energy must be something different from common fire, yet having so much of a similar elemental nature as to demand a similar name. The translator has used the word *seems* as a corresponding expression for an idea hypothetically strange.

The examples of הפך and נהפך show that, in this sense of transformation, they may have a subject after as well as before them, or a double nominative—being, in this respect, like the substantive verbs of *being* and *becoming*. In this way, כמו אש, taken as one compound idea, may be regarded as the post-subject of נהפך. The preposition ל, coming as it does, in the majority of the cases cited, does not affect this principle, since it does not denote approach merely, but the one thing actually becoming the other. In some of the most

* There would seem to be denoted something of an *elemental* distinction, in the nearest way the Hebrew language could express it, though, in fact, it differs from the Greek only in putting the *qualitative* sign at the beginning, instead of the end of the word. Thus the Rabbinical writers use the similar particle כַּמָּה, and the noun כַּמּוּת, derived from it, for *quantity*. It is commonly said, that the ancients held *earth, air, fire* and *water* to be *the* four elements; but it would be more correct to say, that they used these words as representative, not of simple substances, in our modern chemical sense, but of four supposed *states* of matter, like *fluid, solid, gaseous, etc.* All things were only varied forms of the same matter ever passing into different states. This is a very old thought that the human mind, in some way, had become possessed of long before the dawn of any exact inductive science. It is, in fact, the old Orphic Protean fable: the first matter taking all forms—all things turning into each other—the *same matter*, yet different *things*, because having different *forms;* as, on the other hand, it might be *different matter*, coming and going, yet the *same thing*, because preserving the same *form*, idea or law. Modern science, though she laughs at alchemy, has not yet exploded this. The denominating the four elementary states of matter by the names *earth, fire, water, etc.*, was a mere accommodation. When the Greeks wished to be more exact, they used derivative words with a qualitative termination, such as *γήϊνος, πυροειδὴς, etc.* We have a good example, Plato De Leg. 895 D: *'Εὰν ἴδωμέν που ταύτην γενομένην ἐν τῷ γηΐνῳ, ἢ ἐνύδρῳ, ἢ* ΠΥΡΟΕΙΔΕΙ, *τί ποτε φήσομεν ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ πάθος εἶναι.*

striking of these cases, however, there is no preposition, as in a number of those from Leviticus xiii., and no difference is made, in this respect, between the active and the passive, or between the transitive and intransitive usage, as Lev. xiii. 3, שֵׂעָר הָפַךְ לָבָן; ver. 25, נֶהְפַּךְ שֵׂעָר לָבָן, *hair turned white*. In other places, it is ללבן, *to white;* but the idea is the same, and calling it the second subject does not alter the case. It might more properly be rendered *whiteness;* but the real change is from the black hair to the white hair, or from the diseased to the healthy. Ps. cxiv. 8, however, presents two distinct substantives without any preposition: הֹפְכִי הַצּוּר אֲגַם מָיִם, *turned the rock pool of waters;* the passive would have been, הצור נהפך אגם, *the rock turned pool of water.* We have, to some extent, the same idiom in English, as *he turned Mohammedan*, or as Shakspeare says, "*to turn husband.*" In Job xx. 14, we have an example of such a construction all the more striking from the fact that the leading words are the same with those of the passage before us. It is the same verb, the same noun, and the same idea of transformation. It has already been partially cited:

לַחְמוֹ בְּמֵעָיו נֶהְפָּךְ
מְרוֹרַת פְּתָנִים בְּקִרְבּוֹ

In consequence of the rythmical division, made by the accents, we take the second subject in the second member of the parallelism:

His bread in his bowels is turned,
The poison of asps within him.

To make it clear, translators insert a substantive verb in the second clause: *it is*, or *it becomes*, the poison of asps within him. But it is virtually the same with the other examples above given, and so Luther renders it: Seine Speise inwendig im Leibe, wird sich verwandeln in Ottergalle. DELITZSCH is hypercritical on LUTHER here. "The מְרוֹרַת, he says, is not equivalent to לִמְרוֹרַת; but we see that this can be expressed without the preposition, and certainly there are cases where the construction is carried from one member of the parallelism to the other. He would supply the substantive verb in the second clause; but his own translation shows that the poison is but the bread *changed* in its *form*, and therefore in its nature. The idea, therefore, is precisely what Luther gives: "His food in his body is changed into (becomes) the adder poison"—*his bread turns poison.* Job xx. 14 is rendered by JUNIUS and TREMELLIUS in accordance with this idea: cibus ejus in visceribus ejus *conversus fel* aspidum in ipso *fiet.* The passage, Job xxviii. 5, is also so given by them as to preserve the idea of transformation, although the construction is not clearly seen: Terra ex qua prodit cibus, quamvis sub ea *diversum fiat*, velut ignis ardeat.

In verse 9 below, הפך (Kal transitive) has the first of the senses above named, that is, the local, or sense of *subversion*, instead of *conversion:* הָפַךְ מִשֹּׁרֶשׁ הָרִים, "he overturneth the mountains from the root." This might seem to furnish an argument for the sense some would give to the Niphal here; but a careful look at the two places shows that the inference is the other way. In ver. 9 everything is perfectly clear. There is the subject, man, the object, the mountains, and the kind of action, whether hyperbolically expressed or not, quite unmistakable. Why could it not have been so expressed, ver. 5, or with simply a change to the passive? The sense of subversion in the first passage involves great difficulty and obscurity in these respects, as we have already seen. It is much increased by the particle כמו. The rendering, *turned up as fire*, gives no meaning; *as by fire* demands the instrumental preposition, of whose ellipsis, in such a case as this, there is no example. If earth is taken for the subject, the gender is in the way; if תַּחְתֶּיהָ, taken as a noun, then the number; if לֶחֶם, no other meaning can be given to it than that of transformation. The clearness in the one case, the difficulty in the other, shows that some out of the way idea was intended.

Another argument is that throughout the Hebrew Bible the Niphal has everywhere the sense of *transformation*, and is used in the manner of a deponent. Out of more than thirty cases, there are but two which even seem to present any other meaning, and they, on exami-

nation, immediately resolve themselves into the common idea. There is the prediction against Nineveh, Jonah iii. 3, נִינְוֵה נֶהְפָּכֶת. This, however, does not so much denote a local subversion, though that may be a part of it, as a complete *change of state*, from grandeur to ruin and desolation, as said above of Sodom, from fertility to barrenness and salt, from being like "the garden of the Lord" to the blasted waste and putridity of the Dead Sea. Another such seeming case is Ps. lxxviii. 57: "*changed* like the deceitful bow," or the relaxed bow, springing back to the old state from which it had been violently bent; *verwandelt*, as it is rendered by Hupfeld. So Josh. viii. 20, "the pursued *transformed* or *changed* to pursuers;" 1 Sam. x. 6, נֶהְפַּךְ לְאִישׁ אַחֵר, "Saul *transformed* to another man." In Prov. xvii. 20, the idea is not *subversion*, but *contrariety*, the opposite of what is, as in the Arabic sense of אפך. These examples have been dwelt upon so minutely to show that in this obscure place, Job xxviii. 5, the sense of transformation is not only allowable, but demanded, and that the Vulgate rendering, *igni subversa est*, which has been the source of all similar translations, has not only its intrinsic difficulties, but is opposed to the almost exceptionless usage of this Niphal verb.

EXCURSUS IX.

Chap. XXIX. 18.

AND LIKE THE PALM TREE MULTIPLY MY DAYS.

Besides the rendering above given, and in the text, there are two other modes of translating this verse, each well supported by the best authorities. Good reasons, therefore, should be given for departing from them. There is, first, that of the common English version, supported by Conant. It has in its favor, among the moderns, Umbreit, Stickel, Vaihinger, Hahn, Renan and others. Among the ancient authorities, there are the Targum, Syriac, Arabic. So also Luther, Tremellius and Junius, with others given in Poole's Synopsis. It seems plausible and easy, but is open to quite strong objections. In the first place, it makes an incongruous simile. Heaps of corn collected in vast quantities (Gen. xli. 49), promises of immense posterity (Gen. xxxii. 12; Isai. xlviii. 18), great multitudes of people (all Israel, *etc.*, 1 Sam. xiii. 8; 2 Sam. xvii. 11; 1 Kings iv. 20), are well expressed by *sand*, since, in general, it is intended to denote the numberless, or what it is useless to attempt to count. There is an extravagance, however, in applying it to the years, or the days, of any human life, however long. It is, moreover, applied to visible objects, or conceived as visible, that strike us by their multitude, whereas time, however divided, presents no such conception of countless particles. Again, to the comparison כחול, there is almost always added the sea (הים), or the sea shore. Out of twenty examples there are only two exceptions, Hab. i. 9, "gather captivity like the sand," and Ps. cxxxix. 18, in both of which cases the idea of number is so clear as not to need the addition. In Isaiah xlviii. 18, the sea is mentioned right before and after. This, however, although having weight, is not conclusive, since Job may have meant the sand of the desert. In the third place, it makes strongly against this rendering, that it is out of harmony with what follows, even if we take it as an independent assertion (*my root was open*), instead of a continuation of an idea, or of a state preceding as would seem to be denoted by the participle פָּתוּחַ (*my root laid open, etc.*). Ver. 19 is in any way most abrupt and void of connection, if we render חול either sand, or the phœnix bird, and this is the more strange in a passage so emotional, and especially when we consider the wonderful beauty of the language following.

The second rendering is that adopted by Ewald, Dillmann, Delitzsch and Zöckler. Delitzsch, in particular, goes into a labored defence of it. They regard חול as meaning

the phœnix, the fabulous bird said to live a thousand years, then to die, or go out in its nest through some sort of spontaneous combustion, after which it had a kind of second birth, and lived the same *round* again. Hence the argument of DELITZSCH, and which is really the best he offers, that the bird is so called from the Arabic חול, meaning a *circuit* or *round*, though there is no evidence that the Arabians themselves ever used this word for the phœnix, and it has no such meaning in Hebrew. The great authority for this rendering is derived from the Jewish Rabbinical commentators, and from the Talmud. This is suspicious on the very face of it; for, however excellent these commentators in some respects, yet nothing is so apt to lead them into extravagance as a story about some fabulous animal, especially some monstrous creature of a bird. The only thing in the context which seems to favor it in the least is the mention of the word nest, קֵן, in the first clause of the verse; but this is so used for habitation (as in Numb. xxiv. 21, where it is taken as synonymous with מוֹשָׁב, *seat*, and Hab. ii. 9, where it is in parallelism with בַּיִת, house), that the figurative may be regarded as nearly out of sight, not suggestive of any comparison, or as itself suggested by what Job had said, a few verses above, about his own domestic felicity when his young children were round about him as the parent bird in its nest. If we regard it as suggestive of, or suggested by this monstrous phœnix story, then we must carry it through. It was not merely a dying in his nest, his home, like an aged man with his offspring round him, but dying in flames, like the phœnix, to live again. The association of ideas would be monstrous, far removed from the simplicity characteristic of the book, whether we regard it as a later Solomonic invention, or as a true patriarchal history. The Greek fable was a late thing, comparatively, and there is no evidence whatever of its having anything Shemitic about it. If the phœnix was chosen for the comparison, it must have been on account of these marvellous incidents of combustion and revivification, since in other respects, or the mere domestic image of the nest, there are other birds that would have done much better. It is, however, this idea of revivification which commended it to some of the earlier Christian interpreters, who found in it the doctrine of the Resurrection. In the same way, *φοῖνιξ*, in the LXX. version of Ps. xcii. 13 (palma in the Vulgate, תָּמָר in the Hebrew), was also turned into the phœnix; as BOCHART says, *Hieroz.* 819: *Nonnulli Patries avide arripuerunt quia videbatur facere ad resurrectionis fidem:* "The righteous man shall flourish (*revive*) like the phœnix." It may be said, too, that in this place the rendering, phœnix (meaning the fabulous bird), disrupts the two verses, more even than the rendering, *sand.* How it reads! "Multiply my days as a phœnix—my root laid open to the waters, and the dew lodging all night upon my branch." It is not only a most abrupt change of figure in two clauses closely connected by the form and dependence of their words, but a most inharmonious succession of ideas, especially if we carry along what is most prominent in the fable, the images of combustion and of revivification out of the ashes.

The third rendering, and the one which the translator, after the most careful study, has found himself compelled to adopt, is that of the LXX. and of Jerome in the Vulgate. The former renders חול not simply *φοῖνιξ*, which might be taken to mean either the palm or the bird, but removes all ambiguity by using the words *ὥσπερ στέλεχος φοίνικος*, "like the stem of the palm tree." The VULGATE has simply *sicut palma.* The authority they had for this could have been nothing else than the standing Jewish tradition about the word, before the Targum, the Talmud, or those Rabbinical expositors who delighted in such stories as that of the phœnix and the roc. See what a monstrosity they make of שֶׂכְוִי, Job xxxviii. 36, rendering it the *cock:* "Who hath given intelligence to the cock?" in defiance of all the harmonies of the passage. It was not so with the older Jews when the LXX. version was made. Jerome, too, as he tells us in many places of his commentaries, relied much upon his Jewish teacher, who often gave him clear and consistent renderings for words, but nowhere such wild fables as these. From such an earlier and better source must he, as well as the LXX. translators, have derived their rendering of חול. It is much more likely that the later Jewish rendering of phœnix, as a bird, came from a perversion of the LXX., than to suppose the reverse, as DELITZSCH seems to do; namely, that the Greek translators, not un-

derstanding the Hebrew idea attached to חוֹל, or why they rendered it phœnix, took it for the tree, instead of the bird. This is incredible. It should be borne in mind, too, that the Jewish Talmudic and Rabbinical writers connect this with other fables about the phœnix bird, such as that it did not eat of the forbidden fruit which Eve gave to all the other birds (see BOCHART, *Hieroz.* II. p. 818), and other strange things told about it in the ark. These stories show that this phœnix translation which was mingled with them must have been later than that purer source from which these earlier translations were made.

But why should the palm tree be called חוֹל which elsewhere means the sand? Is there the semblance of a philological reason for it, or any reason aside from that beautiful fitness of such a rendering here which all must admit? We think there is. The common name for palm tree in other books of the Old Testament is תָּמָר (*Thamar*), a name given for its *straightness*, its towering figure. This name does not occur in Job, which would seem strange as it is so common an object, and presents such a beautiful comparison, unless it is presented by some other word. There may have been one of those dialectical variations which became so numerous in the later Arabic. In Job's surroundings there was a fitness, too, in naming it from the *sand*, as its more common Hebrew name in Palestine came from its stateliness. There were, moreover, other things suggestive of similar ideas that characterized the palm tree. It was not only an inhabitant of a sandy soil, the beach, or the desert, but it also loved the water. Hence its favorite seat was where these two things were combined as in, or on the borders of, an oasis in the desert, such as Tadmor, named from its palm trees (תַּתְמֹר=תַּדְמֹר, in 1 Kings ix. 18, written תמר), and, on this very account, called Palmyra, the city of palms. Here met together both of those characteristics which so adapt the palm tree to this comparison. It is the tree of the sand; its root loves the water, lies open to the water, which it instinctively finds beneath the sand, whilst its stately towering stem (or *στέλεχος* as the LXX. render it, having this in mind probably), presents its isolated branch (קציר here in the singular, branch, or top, instead of branches) to receive the nourishing dews of heaven. The *sand tree*, or the sand tree near the fountain, and an indication of its presence; this seems a good ground for a poetical name, if it is any more poetical than that which names it for its stateliness. In the Greek version of the Book of Sirach, xxiv. 15, Wisdom says, "I was exalted like the palm tree *ἐν αἰγιαλοῖς*, on the *sea shores*," the *sandy beaches*, or margins of streams running through deserts, like the Jordan near Jericho anciently famous for its palms. Its other quality is attested by PLINY, Lib. xiii., ch. 4, as quoted by BOCHART: Palma gaudet riguis toto-que anno bibere amat. So THEOPHRASTUS, *ἐπιζητεῖ τὸ ναματιαῖον ὕδωρ*, "it seeks the fountain water." These two qualities, loving the *sand*, and loving the water, might seem inconsistent, but it is in fact this compound property which makes it the fertilizer of the desert, by drawing up water that may lie below, and thus becoming the creator, as it were, of such oases as Tadmor or Palmyra. Both, however, meet us in that clear passage, Exod. xv., where the station Elim, in the desert, is so strikingly described as "twelve fountains of water and seventy palm trees." The *sand tree* had made the fountains by which in turn it was nourished. It may be said, in short, that whilst the literal interpretation, the sand, here greatly weakens the figure evidently designed to be carried through both verses (18, 19), the other rendering of the fabulous phœnix utterly destroys it; and the wonder is that men like EWALD and DELITZSCH could have tolerated it for a moment. It cannot be denied, that the translation of the LXX. and Vulgate presents perfectly this exquisite association of ideas. The palm lives long. That adapts it to the first verse, and immediately suggests the charming imagery that follows: the deep root drinking the water in the earth below, the lofty top inhaling the dew of heaven; earthly prosperity crowned with the divine favor.* We cannot wonder that it was a favorite text with old divines, who sought to *accommodate* (and justly, too, for no other book than the Bible seems

* The beauty of this comparison of the righteous to the palm tree cannot be better expressed than in the words of the Rt. Rev. JOHN SAUL HOWSON, in SMITH'S Dictionary of the Bible, Article PALM: "*The Righteous shall flourish, etc.*; it suggests a world of illustration, whether respect be had to the order and regular aspect of the tree, its fruitfulness, the perpetual greenness of its foliage, or the height at which its foliage grows, as far as possible from Earth, and as near as possible to Heaven."

so made for such a purpose) places and figures of this kind to the inward religious experience. They were learned men, and knew more about the letter of the Scriptures than many a boasting Rationalist; but they also heard in it a voice the latter cannot hear. The thought is called up by a passage in the dying experience of Thomas Hallyburton, Professor of Divinity University of St. Andrew's, and author of a most learned and acute work on the *Insufficiency of Natural Religion* (ed. 1714). When near his end, and in the most acute pain, he was asked one morning how he found himself. "Och, sirs," he replied, "sore enough in body, but sweet in soul, my root spread out by the waters of life, and the dew lay all night upon my branch."

It confirms the comparison and the rendering given in the text, that the palm, as has been said, is a long living tree. Any one can see how much better it suits the simile of growing years than the *sand*, which is suitable only to the comparison of visible objects confusing the eye by their number, and thus becoming *countless* (*numeroque carentis* arenæ, as Horace says, *Odes*, Lib. i. 24). It is illy adapted to denote *succession* of any kind, especially that of a flowing quantity like time, or the years and days of life. The beautiful propriety of the figure, Ps. xcii. 13, where it is joined with the cedar in expressing the idea of a hale old age, furnishes also a strong argument in support of the rendering adopted here: "The righteous shall flourish like a palm tree (ὡς φοῖνιξ), like a cedar in Lebanon shall he grow (יִשְׂגֶּה, LXX. πληθυνθήσεται, VULG. multiplicabitur); they shall yet bear fruit in old age; they shall be *resinous* and *green*:" They shall be *evergreens*. To sum up—the comparison of the sand is defective and incongruous, as we have shown; that of the fabulous phœnix, monstrous and unscriptural; this suits every aspect of the figure.

EXCURSUS X

ON THE SUPPOSED LOCALITY OF CHAP. XXX.

If there were scenic directions in the Book of Job, as in modern acted dramas, this chapter might, perhaps, have had appropriately placed before it the inscription:

SCENE—*The Border of the Desert.*

Such a direction would seem to have some plausible ground of support from internal evidence. The imagination, if it be called such, is not only admissible, but has much to make it rational. Nothing is told us to that effect; but certainly it would be a very natural supposition, that the wretched Job, now become an outcast, stripped of property and children, abandoned by his wife, and afflicted by this terribly loathsome and infectious disease, had removed himself, or had been removed, to a distance from the scenes of his former life. It is to the credit of his three friends, notwithstanding the harshness appearing in some parts of their argument, that they ran the risks, and bore the disagreeableness, of remaining with him under these circumstances. Such a view in regard to his location is quite consistent with many things in the preceding chapters. It would very naturally suggest some of the wild frontier scenery Job describes in Ch. xxviii., especially the first part. It would vividly recall, by way of contrast, the scenes of his former life, the abundant "milk, the flowing streams of oil" (xxix. 5, 6), now coming before his imagination like the Sharab (שָׁרָב, Isaiah xlix. 10), or mirage of the desert. So we might say, too, in respect to the brilliant nocturnal images presented in such passages as xxii. 12; xxv. 5; xxvi. 13. The stars and constellations come out most gloriously in the clear, dry atmosphere of the desert. It gives them, too, a more imposing appearance of height when seen as the only striking objects visible from an extended barren plain:

Lo! where Eloah dwells! the heaven sublime!
Behold! the crown of stars! how high they are!

This is language much more likely to be used in the vast solitary sahara, than in scenes crowded with the sight, or the memory, of well known multifarious objects. So Ch. xxv. 13, where Bildad says: "Look to the moon, behold!" or where Job, in his reply, *points* to the brilliant constellation of the serpent nearly overhead (xxvi. 13). It is probable, too, that these discourses mainly took place by night, as the cooler, calmer hour, the season of contemplation, of "good thinking," as denoted by that beautiful word Ευφρόνη, the Greek poetical name for the night. We know, too, from other sources (HARIRI, and other Arabian Seance writers), that the Nightly Consessus was, among the early Arabians, a favorite mode of grave discussion, so established, in fact, that it gave rise to a peculiar verb and noun employed in the Ante-Koranic times for that very purpose, *samara, to discourse by night, noctem confabulari lucente luna,* with derivatives carrying the same idea, and denoting manner and place.

The chief argument, however, for supposing such a scenic location here comes from this 30th chapter itself. These vagabonds, so graphically pictured to us, these Troglodytes, or dwellers in holes of the earth, as ver. 6 represents them, could never have so haunted Job had he been at or near his old abode in the vicinity of the city (xxix. 7) or castle, or in the fertile country adjacent. When they came out of their desert holes, and visited this fertile region, it was only as beggars driven by want, and to whom, on account of their incapacity for labor, or their general shiftlessness, even the meanest employments were denied (xxx. 1, 2). These wild, famished, uncouth creatures now find him on the border of their own desert homes, and crowd around him in a sort of stupid wonder at his deplorable appearance. Their astonishment at the strange, emaciated man is soon turned to the most brutal scorn. They make his defenceless condition the object of their senseless, savage mirth—of gross insults, and, at last, of violent assaults. See a similar description of the same, or a similar crew, chap. xxiv. 5–8.

EXCURSUS XI.

מַלְאָךְ מֵלִיץ

THE ANGEL INTERCESSOR.

CHAP. XXXIII. 23, 24.

And is there then an angel on his side—
The interceding one—of thousands chief—
To make it known to man—His righteousness;
So will He show him grace, and say:
Deliver him from going down to death;
A ransom I have found.

GESENIUS renders מלאך מליץ *angelus intercedens pro hominibus apud Deum,* μεσίτης, tutelaris, and refers to Matt. xviii. 20. In this idea of a supernatural being, or a divine messenger, he has agreeing with him EWALD, SCHLOTTMANN, DILLMANN, DELITZSCH, ZOECKLER, and, among the older commentators, MERCERUS, SCULTETUS, COCCEIUS and others. The VULGATE has *angelus loquens,* but meaning a celestial being, which LUTHER follows: ein Engel, einer aus tausend. To this corresponds RENAN:

Mais s'il trouve un ange intercesseur,
Un des innombrables êtres célestes.

On the other hand, UMBREIT, ROSENMUELLER and CONANT maintain that it is a mere

human messenger, and that by it, most likely, Elihu intends himself. The reasons against this latter part of the idea are most conclusively given by SCHLOTTMANN and DELITZSCH. It is not to be imagined, that Elihu, whatever some may say of his vanity and forwardness, should dare to represent himself as a divine or prophetic messenger to Job, sent in this way to announce to him the divine will, and to promise him the divine forgiveness. The word לָאָדָם, as COCCEIUS observes, forbids it. To announce *to man* seems to imply something higher than a human messenger. But מלאך, by itself, would be sufficient. The almost universal usage of this word makes it the representative of a heavenly messenger. The comparatively few cases in which it is used for a human herald, such as 1 Sam. xvi. 19; xix. 11; xix. 20; 1 Kings xix. 2; Job i. 14, ever present a context forbidding any other idea. Compare Job i. 14 and iv. 8. Everything in this passage suggests the latter rather than the former, and throws the burden of proof upon those who contend for the human character. DELITZSCH remarks that there is more of angelology in Elihu's speeches than in other parts of the book; but a better argument is drawn from the close connection of this account with the vision-warnings mentioned just above (vers. 14, 15), as among the modes of the divine instruction. The transition is very easy from these to angelophanies, if they are not, in fact, identical—that is, the angel appearance occurring in vision.

The language, too, "*one of a thousand*," coupled with the epithet, *Mediator*, or *Intercessor*, shows that something more is meant than an ordinary angel, to say nothing of its being human. It seems to denote the chief of a mighty host. It immediately calls to mind the מלאך יהוה so often mentioned in the Bible as the divine representative, the angel of whom the patriarchs speak, Jacob's הַמַּלְאָךְ הַגֹּאֵל, Gen. xlviii. 6, "the Angel that redeemed him from all evil," the "Angel of the Presence" mentioned in the Pentateuch, and, lastly, carries our thoughts to the Great *Intercessor* of our Christian faith, and of whom all the rest are prefigurations. It may be here but the germ of the idea; but it may be regarded as containing all that is afterwards unfolded. It is, in truth, a very old idea, and dates back to that early promise of one who was to be the avenger of the murdered human race, and the great champion of the divine mercy. Job may have had in mind this theanthropic idea in the remarkable declaration xix. 25, where he speaks of his Goel or Redeemer as surviving kinsman, and in xvi. 19, as his "Witness on high," שָׂהֲדִי, his Attesting Angel, as the same name is afterwards used in the Arabian Ante-Mohammedan theology. See KORAN Surat xi. 21.

What seems strongly to confirm this view of the מלאך מליץ is the mention, just above, of another class of superhuman beings, the מְמִתִים, or *slayers*, ver. 22. The manifest emphasis of the passage, and the manner of using this latter word, show that something more is meant than diseases, or the pains of the last moments. It indicates a belief, to say the least, such as is found in the early Arabian theology, and referred to in the Koran Surat lxxix., entitled *An-naziat*, "The Angels who tear forth the souls of men with violence," as distinguished from others called *An-nashetat*, or "those who take them away with gentleness." There is in the Old Testament more than one glimpse of a terrific idea, namely of some outward invisible violence at the death of the wicked, or of invisible powers, whatever may be their character, who are present to take them forcibly away. It is intimated in that passage (before referred to, Note 2, ver. 3, chap. vii.), Luke xii. 20, by the word ἀπαιτοῦσι (*they demand*, exact), used without any expressed subject, as though the real agents were too fearful to mention. So in the other passages there quoted, Ps. xlix. 15 and Prov. xiv. 32. In the first, some unseen and unnamed powers are represented as *putting* (שַׁתּוּ, a strong Piel word), *forcing*, "*driving*, the wicked into Sheol," where Death is their shepherd (feeds them), in strongest contrast with Ps. xxiii. 4, where the Good Shepherd (the Mediator Angel) walks with the just in the *terra umbrarum*. In the other passage (Prov. xiv. 32), no beings are mentioned; but the contrast is all the more striking between the death of the righteous man, full of hope of some kind, and the violent ejection from the body, or their "being driven away in their wickedness," that befalls the other class. According to RABBI TANHUM, one of the most acute of Jewish commentators, there lies the same thought in the passage, 1 Sam.

xxv. 29. It is the contrast between "the soul of David bound up in the *bundle of life*," and the souls of his enemies, whom Abigail speaks of as destined to be "cast out violently," as though "slung out of a sling." It is the language of a questionable woman making a questionable prayer, but still is it valuable, the Rabbi remarks, as showing the common belief of the common mind in Israel. He himself regards the expression, "slung out of the middle of the sling," as interpreted by its opposite, "bound up in the bundle of life." It is everlasting security and rest in the one case, an everlasting unrest in the other—a violent *driving forth*, "the sport of nature," as he strangely styles it, "tossed evermore on the *waves of matter*, or projected into infinite space, or whirled round eternally, and never finding any termination to its wanderings." It is something like the interpretation that AL BEIDAWI gives to the passage of the KORAN, Surat lxxix., before cited. See POCOCKE, Notes to MAIMONIDES, Porta Moses, p. 92, 93.

To one who thus holds that the ממתים (vers. 22) denote the death angels (as do the best commentators even among the Rationalists), it would seem to follow, a fortiori, that the מלאך מליץ of the next verse must be also superhuman, though far excelling in goodness and power. This makes it the more strange that the interpretation thus given to ממתים should be rejected by SCHLOTTMANN, whilst he argues so strongly for the angel meaning in the latter place. DELITZSCH dwells at length upon the passage referred to in Genesis, and elsewhere, in support of the view here taken of the Angel Mediator, and makes a very conclusive argument. So in regard to the ממתים, he refers to the "destroying angel," הַמַּלְאָךְ הַמַּשְׁחִית, 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, and "the evil angels," מַלְאֲכֵי רָעִים of Ps. lxxviii. 49. For the "one of a thousand" he refers, in like manner, to Ps. xxxiv. 8, the מלאך יהוה, the "Angel of the Lord who encampeth (as though head of a host) round about them who fear God, and *delivereth* them." The words "one of a thousand" cannot denote a choice man. There is no occasion nor ground for saying any such thing here, and Ecclesiastes vii. 28, which is sometimes cited, is far from supporting it. Still less, as before remarked, is there ground for holding that in the use of such distinguishing language Elihu has reference to himself. Whether it be real modesty which he professes, or mock modesty, such as those who underrate the character charge upon him, it would be equally inconsistent with such a claim.

There is another expression in the passage which suggests an evangelical idea, or the germ of one, as furnishing the easiest interpretation. It is the word יָשְׁרוֹ, *his righteousness*, or *his rectitude*. The idea of anything due the patient here described, either as merit or as any *uprightness* of his own that needs to be *revealed* to him, would seem wholly out of place. He is represented as a penitent who turns to God from warnings given in dreams, or in consequence of sore chastisements. His character, as estimated by himself, is given in ver. 27:

I sinned, I made my way perverse.

Neither can it mean *his profit*, as DELITZSCH renders it: "to declare unto man what is for his profit." Its most simple and literal rendering is: "to show unto man *his* justice," and this must be God's justice. Such an interpretation would seem to be demanded by the word לְהַגִּיד, *to reveal.* If, however, the pronoun is taken as grammatically belonging to *man*—though there is nothing which compels such a view—it is his righteousness (man's righteousness) as made and given to him by God; just as the *spirit* which God gives to man, Gen. vi. 3, is called by Him רוּחִי, *my spirit*, or as the animation given by him to the animals is called (Ps. civ. 29) *their spirit*, רוּחָם. It, however, need not be confined to the stricter evangelical sense of justification. יָשְׁרוֹ may be taken, in a general sense, as denoting God's merciful dealing with the penitent man in not judging him according to his sins, whatever may be the ground for so doing. Taken either way, it comes to the same thing. And this is "the righteousness of faith," as we find it all through the Old Testament, namely, the feeling of acceptance on some other ground than that of human merit, although what that other ground might be were almost wholly unknown. Whether it was the obedient offering of the sacrifice as a symbol of something unrevealed, or a hope in God's pure mercy, it was clearly distinct from works as a ground of debt. It left to God "to provide the Lamb" that truly "takes away sin," in His own unknown, yet most heartily trusted way.

This, it may be said, is "a finding of evangelical ideas in the Old Testament." But what is there strange or inconsistent in such a mode of interpretation if such ideas are really there, having their deep seat, in fact, in the human conscience ever demanding something out of itself as the ground of the divine acceceptance? It may be defended on the rational principle, that if the Bible is, in any true and hearty sense, "the Word of God," or in any sense which would authorize the Rationalist to call it *Sacra Scriptura*, as he is patronizingly fond of doing, then, in order to be worthy of such a title, it must be a *one* book, as truly as it is a *divine* book. If there is any meaning in such a characterization, it follows that every part bears upon every other part—shadow here, substance there, a gleam in one place, the noon-day light in another—and every part upon the whole. Otherwise we deny to God's highest gift to man a wholeness which is deemed essential to the lowest physical organism. Especially does this hold in respect to all connected with the promise, the office, and the work of the Messiah, or the great redeeming power so early predicted in "the roll of revelation," בִּמְגִלַּת סֵפֶר, Ps. xl. 8. Says DELITZSCH: "The Angel of Jehovah of primeval history is the oldest prefigurement in the history of redemption of the future incarnation, without which the Old Testament history would be a confused *quodlibet* of premises and radii without a conclusion and a centre" This was the principle on which the learned and pious commentators of the seventeenth century proceeded in all their interpretations: The Bible is a *one* book, every part bearing more or less on every other. In their applications of the idea they sometimes stumble us. We draw back from following COCCEIUS, VITRINGA, and CARYL in the extent to which they would carry it. They find too much in a passage; so we think; they discover resemblances our eyes, sometimes, fail to see (it may be, because we lack the measure of their spiritual insight), but we cannot help feeling that they often strike out a wondrous light, such as we cannot ascribe to any accidental accommodations. They are, at least, accommodations, if we will call them such, that no other book, and no other literature, could ever furnish, whatever amount of pious or æsthetic imagination we might apply in the attempt to produce a similar effect. Let a man try it on the KORAN, or on any classical production.

The book of Job especially may, in this way, be regarded as a nursery of evangelical ideas, though, in many cases, just appearing in their germs. They grow out of the extreme condition of the sufferer, his utter want of help, and the inability of his friends to meet his case with any of the ordinary methods of reproof or consolation. They are pressed out, as it were, by the need that is felt of some ground of justification or support stronger and higher than the soul can elsewhere find. The reading of the whole Bible shows that this is God's mode of revealing truth *through the human itself*, instead of the dogmatical way of abstract precept, having no connection with any actual experience. Such cases may surprise us, sometimes, by their apparent isolation, and yet when an emotional idea is thus brought out of the soul itself, there is ever some word to sustain it, some hint, some strange thought, seeming to stand alone in the older scripture, as something dimly revealed, but appearing in all its glory in the later revelations of the divine and human characters.

"*To declare unto man His righteousness.*" The Genevan version annexes a note to this: "To declare wherein man's righteousness standeth, which is through the justification of Jesus Christ, and faith therein." DR. CONANT cites this, though we hardly know whether as agreeing with it, or as implying that it goes too far. It would certainly be going too far as a translation, or even a paraphrase; but so evangelical a man as DR. CONANT would not object to it as a fair inference from Scripture taken as a whole, or as a comparison of this germinal idea with other and fuller parts of the Bible.

When we take into view the whole book of Job, whether in respect to the claim made for it of some divine authorship, or of mere dramatic consistency, the idea very naturally arises, that this מלאך מליץ, here mentioned as the comforter of the penitent in extreme affliction, and whom Elihu would especially regard as the *intercessor* in such a case as that of Job, is one of the בני אלהים, or "sons of God" mentioned i. 6 and ii. 1, or rather בן אלהים, *the son of God* pre-eminently. Such would be the idea suggested by the description, "*the one*," or *the chief*, "among a thousand." Something like it would seem to have been in

the mind of the Targumist, and to have suggested his rendering פרקליטא, παράκλητος (the Comforter). The opposite of this in the Targumic dialect is קטיגור, Gr. κατηγορος, the Accuser. The opening super-earthly scene at once presents itself. Even from that date, this Ben Elohim, son of God, or Paraclete, may have been commissioned to sustain the sufferer in the great and unequal conflict he is called to wage with Satan, the Accuser, the Adversary, who is permitted to try Job to the uttermost. This brings to mind the scenes described in the New Testament, the Temptation, the sore conflict of the Mediator himself when representing humanity, and his great triumph over that same hostile power with which he has been contending since the announcement in the Protevangel. Whether such is a rational mode of using Scripture depends altogether upon the settlement of this question which may be said to form the dividing line between the Rationalistic and the Evangelical mode of Scriptural exposition: Is the Bible a one book? Is there a one mind throughout, or is it a mass of isolated fragments, having no more connection than the separate parts that go to make up what we might call a Jewish or a Greek literature? Is it a grand epic having a true epic unity: *The Book of the Wars of Messiah* with Satan the Enemy of Mankind? or is it a fragmentary Iliad, a collection of ancient songs or ballads without any uniting idea, as some of these same Rationalists falsely characterize the great Grecian epic?

"*A ransom I have found*,"—a covering, an atonement—a cancelling or *blotting out* (*putting out of view*) as the etymological image (*obduxit*, *oblevit*, Gen. vi. 14) would more exactly denote. It is not easy to keep away the idea of something evangelical, or protevangelical, when we read these words in such a connection. It is God's representation, capable of being spread over a wider or a narrower view. There is no language of which the scriptural writers seem more fond than this of *blotting out*, *covering*, putting away from the divine eye, or hiding, as it were, human sin. What more do we want than this image connected with the hearty belief that there is a true ground for it, out of man, and in something done by the Mediator by whom it is effected, some transcendent virtue in him, or some ineffable deed of glory, so bright that it turns the divine eye to itself, and away from the sin of him who pleads it—covering it over as it were, blotting it out, or hiding it as something lost and unremembered in the depths of the sea.

> O happy is that man, and blest,
> Whose sins are *covered o'er*.
> —SCOTCH VERSION PS. XXXII. 1.

It may be called an anthropopathic figure; but volumes on "The Philosophy of the Atonement" could not so penetrate the intellect by first penetrating the affections. It should be remembered, too, that whatever may be the nature of the atonement, it is God's provision. "I have found," מָצָאתִי. DELITZSCH well remarks on this word, that it denotes not a mere casual meeting with a thing, but a *finding* after *seeking*—in other words, a *providing*. The language here, he says, is suggestive of Heb. ix. 12, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος, "having *found* an eternal redemption (an eternal ransom) for us."

"*Deliver him*," ver. 24. The language may be applied to a wider, or to a narrower deliverance. It may be a recovery from bodily sickness, or from spiritual disease, or from both combined; it may have reference to the temporal or the eternal; but it is the same essential salvation. Noah when he watched the ascending flame of the burnt-offering, Job when he said, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," David when he said, "Blessed is the man whose sins are covered," the woman who touched the hem of Christ's garment that she might be healed of her bodily disease, and Paul when he said, "There is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus," had, each of them, the same essential "righteousness of faith."

EXCURSUS XII.

THE WHIRLWIND, XXXVIII. 1; AND THE PERSON SPOKEN OF, VER. 2.

The fact that סערה here has the article attached to it is not to be disregarded in determining the plan and connections of the book, although it may not be deemed absolutely conclusive. *The* whirlwind (הַסְּעָרָה) seems certainly to suggest something known, or of whose presence, or approach, the reader has, in some way, had intimation. So SCHLOTTMANN: "The article shows that that very storm is meant, the coming up of which Elihu has already described." Instead of being weakened, this is rather strengthened by the view of זהב (the golden sheen) as presented in the translator's notes to xxxvii. 22 and 23. The סופה, or thunderstorm, is the forerunner of the סערה, just as the tornado, as now witnessed, often has such a predecessor. Whether natural or supernatural, or a combination of both (since the Scriptures, as we have seen, LANGE *Gen. Special Int.* to Chap. I., page. 145, does not make that sharp distinction which our philosophy does), it would be equally consistent with the view of the book as a drama, or as an actual narrative of fact. Like the pillar of cloud and fire in the wilderness, or the volcanic flames of Sinai, this סערה may have had mingled with it more or less of meteorological causation, and this warrants an appeal to the peculiar electric or amber hue that is sometimes seen in such wind clouds, giving them an appearance majestic, yet more awing than the darkest nimbus charged with rain.

DELITZSCH, however, thinks that the article is to be taken generically, namely, *the whirlwind*, as distinguished from other species of winds, and so equivalent to *a whirlwind.* CONANT and others of our best commentators take the same view. It may, doubtless, be so regarded, and therefore the article by itself is not conclusive. There is, however, another argument equally strong, whether we read with the article or without it, and that is the great improbability of such a declaration : "The Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind," or "out of a whirlwind," if no mention had been made, and no intimation had been given, either in the narrative, or in the dramatic action, of any such event. The improbability of it is not diminished—it is rather greater—if we suppose such announcement to come right after Job's words, xxxi. 40, or even some of the verses above supposed to be misplaced in order to favor such a theory.* The very fact that this undramatic abruptness, as it would in that case be, is not seen or felt by the reader, comes from the Elihu portion, and the effect it has upon the minds even of those who reject it as spurious. Indeed, a very strong and conclusive argument for the genuineness of this Elihu portion, is the very fact, that it makes such an appropriate preparation for the Theophany and the whirlwind by which it is attended. This we have endeavored to show elsewhere (see INT. THEISM, Note p. 26, 27). The view intended to be enforced here is, that this is felt all the more powerfully from its having been thus brought in dramatically, without any intervening narrative clause, such as occurs in other parts. But that there should have been no announcement, not even of the narrative kind, would be a singular thing. It would be especially so in a drama where all the events explanatory of the great action are so minutely given in the prologue and in the appendix, to say

* Everything in the context goes to show that ver. 40 of that chapter is the real peroration of Job's speech. It is in the vindicatory style of the whole chapter, pervading it throughout, and resumed at ver. 38, whilst vers. 35, 36 and 37 form one of those passionate parenthetical outbursts interspersed here and there, as in vers. 6–11, 12–23–28, and which, while making the speech more irregular and impetuous, add greatly, on that very account, to its rhetorical force. The whole chapter is a most solemn appeal, an answering "like a hero-man with his loins girded," just as God bids him do, xxxviii. 3. It is, in fact, a continued *oath*, and its sharp imprecatory clause, ver. 40: "Let thistles grow instead of wheat" (let my land be cursed, if the injustice and oppression you charge me with, chap. xxii., be true; equivalent to our "So help me God"), forms the most fitting conclusion that can be imagined. It should be remembered, too, that although Job appeals to the Almighty, xxxi. 35, the whole chapter is a vindication of himself from the injustice of his friends, and has no reference to any plan or *counsel* of God, such as DELITZSCH supposes to be intended by עֵצָה, xxxviii. 2.

nothing of the narrative account of Elihu, his country and his kindred, previous to his speaking. It has been charged that he appears too suddenly, and with too little mention of the manner and reason of his coming. God's speaking out of a whirlwind, with nothing said or hinted of a whirlwind, or of any theophanic accompaniment, would seem a much stranger fact, especially if we regard the book as a drama. However different the forms of dramatic representation, it is a universal characteristic that some preparatory warning, either by speech, or action, or by something called machinery, is given of celestial appearances. In truth, nothing could be more undramatic than the other view, especially if we read chap. xxxviii. as coming directly after chap. xxxi. We have a sententious moralizing on the divine ways; no intimation is given of approaching deity; when all at once it is said: "The Lord answered out of *the* whirlwind," or a whirlwind, מן הסערה, a Hebrew word for the most violent tempest, tornado, procella, רוח סערה (see Ps. cvii. 25; Ezek. xiii. 11, 13; Isai. xxix. 6; Jon. i. 4, 12; Jerem. xxiii. 19; xxv. 32). Had it been said: The Lord answered from heaven, as the angel called to Abraham, or from the skies, or from a cloud, or from the air, or from any common constant condition of physical surroundings, it would not have been so remarkable, although, even in such cases, not according to scriptural usage, which always prepares us, in some way, for such a divine speaking.* It is very much as though the sixth verse of Exod. iii. had come directly after the first: "And Moses was feeding the flock, *etc.;* and God said, I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." Or had verse 6 read: "and God spake out of the burning bush," or "a burning bush," when no intimation whatever had been given of any such appearance, then the case would be perfectly parallel to this in its strange abruptness. In like manner, had Exod. xx. 1: "And God spake all these words saying," *etc.*, come directly after xix. 1: "The same day came the children of Israel into the wilderness of Sinai," the leaving out of all the intervening appearances would not be more strange, or contrary to Bible usage. There, too, as in the other case, would the wonder have been enhanced, had chap. xx. commenced: "and God spake out of the fire," when nothing had been said or hinted in respect to any fire natural or supernatural. So too in 1 Kings xix. 11, God's speaking to Elijah in the still small voice that followed the earthquake, the wind, and the fire, might just as well have immediately followed his speeches to the priests of Baal. Compare other theophanies of the Old Testament, as also those of the New, such as Matt. iii. 16, 17; Acts ix. 3, and the difference will be seen at once. The attending circumstances differ in each case; but the reader cannot fail to see the point of the parallel. In like manner, the divine declarations† to the prophets have their preparatory narrative announcements. Surely there would have been something here like the mention of the gathering phenomena out of which the Lord spake to Moses and Elijah, had there not been dramatic intimations which, when rightly understood, prepare us for the voice. Such, we think, is the effect of reading the xxxvi. and xxxvii. chapters (the latter part of Elihu's speech). The most unlearned reader, without any helps of exegesis, though having a very inadequate view of the meaning of many verses, gets such an impression. It is in the very atmosphere of the style and language, we may say. It is an impression, growing more and more vivid till the close, of something fearful present and approaching. There is felt to be a naturalness in Elihu's cry, ver. 22: "With God is dreadful majesty;" and this is the reason why so little surprise is felt by such a reader at the words "out of the whirlwind," at the opening of chap. xxxviii. The exegete would get the same impression should

* DILLMANN thinks the article has no significance, because "always, whenever God draws nigh in majesty, or as a Judge of the earth, it is usually the case that the whirlwind announces and attends his coming." It would have been well had he pointed out some cases where *the whirlwind* itself is not announced, or some account given of it in narration, or some intimation of its coming or presence in the scene itself. The argument is just the other way; since, if this view be taken, there is no other case like it in all Scripture.

† To this there might seem opposed the frequent declarations of the Pentateuch: "And the Lord spake unto Moses;" but in them no outward appearances are mentioned at all, which at once destroys any parallelism between such cases and this: "The Lord spake out of a whirlwind." There is, moreover, no reason to believe that there were any theophanic appearances at all in such communications. A veil is thrown over the whole subject; but they were most likely wholly *subjective*, or through nothing more outward than the oracle, the Shekinah, or the *Urim* and *Thummim*. So of many of the prophetic revelations. We may regard them as mainly subjective by dreams, or otherwise, not specified because of their frequency. An objective vision is always minutely and even pictorially detailed, as Isai. vi. and Ezek. i.

he take the poem according to its plan, and give up his uncritical effort to discredit the very part which, more than all others, proves the dramatic unity.

Another question arises out of this portion of the book: Who is the person addressed, or rather spoken of, as one who darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge? In the INT. THEISM, p. 25, 26, a few reasons are given for referring it to Elihu, to which something more may here be added. DELITZSCH thinks that the use of the participle form מַחְשִׁיךְ denotes its reference to some one who has just stopped, or been stopped speaking. The remark is in the main just, and if the genuineness of the Elihu portion is maintained, it would follow that Elihu was intended. DELITZSCH, however, uses it for the other purpose, namely, as showing that Job was the last speaker, who, he says, "is interrupted* by Jehovah without any intervening speaker having come forward." The word "interrupted" (unterbrochen) is certainly at war with the impression made by the close of ch. xxxi. 38, 39, 40. Job seems to bring what he intended to say there to a full rhetorical and most impressive close. Even without the formula: "The words of Job are ended," on which we have elsewhere remarked (see Note 45 to ver. 40 of ch. xxxi.), everything goes to show that he was done, that he meant it for a final defence, to which he would add no more. Elihu, on the other hand, towards the close of his speech, shows appearances of embarrassment and confusion: "O teach us what to say: we cannot order our speech by reason of darkness; is it told Him that I am speaking?" Then there is the cry at the appearance of the golden cloud, the Allah Akbar (*God is great*) that follows, and the finishing word as of one overwhelmed by the sense of a near divine presence, and of the insignificance of all human wisdom, and human counsel in comparison with it: "He regards none that are wise in heart." The words are on his lips when the awful voice breaks forth. Such is the scene, briefly but faithfully sketched from the graphic outlines of Scripture. To those who are fond of calling the book a drama, and of praising its artistic merit, it may be said, that nothing could be more artistic, more dramatic, unless it be that actual reality which exceeds all art. If it be a work of fiction, then "the later poet," as DELITZSCH calls him, is the equal of the older, and by his skill in the difficult work of perfectly adapting an interpolated portion, shows that he might well have been the author of the whole.

The expression "darkening counsel," if we suppose it to refer to Elihu, may be taken as descriptive of this perturbation. We need not regard it as the language of censure, but as a mere passing notice of the last trembling speaker and his confused utterance, before the voice directly turns to Job, who, though silent, is yet the principal figure in the scene. Again, the style of the language: "Who is this that *darkens counsel* by words without knowledge?" do not seem to characterize well the close of Job's speech, chap. xxxi. They might have been charged as bold and confident, or as impious perhaps, but they were very *plain* words, very *clear*, and, as against the friends, very pertinent. They were, too, most true, as his inmost conscience testified. Ver. 37 of that chapter is simply a most solemn appeal to God, an oath or attestation. It is not repelled as impious. God meets the appeal, and evidently treats it with respect, as appears in the next verse, xxxviii. 3, which, beyond all doubt, is directly addressed to Job: "Gird up now thy loins like a man" (like a hero man, כגבר). It is as though, in comparison with other men, the Almighty declared him a worthy antagonist whom He frankly meets, and meant to give him some intimation of a sterner encounter than he had yet known: It is not thy three misjudging friends, it is not the young Elihu, with well-intentioned but imperfect and darkened counsel, it is I who ask thee now (the emphasis in אשאלך is on the first person as we have endeavored to give it in the translation), and to ME art thou to make answer, if thou canst. There are certainly fair grounds for maintaining that this new style of language in ver. 3, and the coloring given to it by נָא, the particle of respect and entreaty, indicate a turning away to a new object after Elihu had been

* This, of course, is a rejection of the Elihu portion. So the Rationalist Commentators say boldly. DELITZSCH, however, would be thought to maintain its integrity, and even inspiration, as a true part of Holy Scripture. But nothing seems more illogical (*pace tanti viri* would we say it) than his attempt to do this, in what he has to say about "the older poet" and "the later poet." The argument that would patch Scripture in this way would prove the LXX. and Syriac Versions to be also parts of the Scriptural canon.

disposed of in the previous verse. Some attention had to be given to him as the last speaker, and immediately the great matter of the address is brought up: "But as for thee, Job, now prepare thyself for a sharper questioning."

That the words of ver. 2 are spoken of Elihu may be inferred from the word עֵצָה, *counsel;* though the argument may not be deemed conclusive. The primary and most usual idea of this noun is that of *counsel* in the sense of *advice, instruction,* which it derives directly from the universal usage of the verb יָעַץ, as 1 Kings i. 12, where both are found, איעצך נא עצה, "I will counsel (advise) thee a counsel," or a counselling; for the one sense easily passes into the other, the instructing or the instruction. In this very usual acceptation, it well describes Elihu's counsel or instruction to Job as pronounced here dark and inadequate. Another frequent sense is *prudence, wisdom* or skill in counselling. In this way it is ascribed to Deity along with other attributes, such as חכמה, בינה. For examples of this, see especially the book of Proverbs. So in Job xii. 13, "with Him is counsel and strength," Isaiah xxviii. 29, and other places. But it may be questioned whether it ever means the divine purpose, or plan, or providence (as RENAN renders it), whether general or special. Yet this is the sense given to it by those who make Job the object of these words of seeming reproof. "It is the divine decree, or plan," says DELITZSCH, "full of purpose or connection, which Job darkens, that is, distorts by judging it falsely, or, as we say, places in a false light." One would hardly get this idea from reading the speeches without any reference to any such supposed censure. It might have some good application to the speeches of the three friends, for they, in their wisdom, assume to know something of the divine purpose, and that it must be to punish Job for his sins. Elihu maintains the idea of discipline, but all are equally wide of the real purpose, which is wholly super-earthly and superhuman, as set forth in the prologue. It is to show to Satan, and the Bene Elohim, that a man on earth "could serve God for nought." It was not a purpose either of punishment or of discipline, primarily, or for any good or evil to Job considered as the direct object, but, *through his sufferings* (see Eph. iii. 10; John ix. 3), to make this fact, or this truth, "known to the Principalities and Powers in the Heavens, κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰώνων, according to the purpose of the eternities." But Job knew nothing of any such purpose. He could not understand it at all; he could form no conception of it because it had not been revealed to him. Neither had he expressed any opinion about it, as the others, in their wisdom, had done, and, therefore, he could not be said to darken it. His language throughout is a righteous protest against their unjust expositions of the case, mingled with a constant moan over his own misery, so acute in itself, and rendered still more intolerable by a sense of some mysterious estrangement of one whom he had loved and served. It was God, in fact, with all reverence be it said, who had made dark his own counsel to Job, and on account of this he so touchingly mourns: "O that I knew where I might find Him;" "He hideth His face from me;" but He knoweth *the way that I take.*" This was his consolation, though all was dark to him in respect to *the ways of God,*—"when He hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold;" "for truly the purpose concerning me (חֻקִּי my decree) He will accomplish, and many such (unfathomable decrees) are with Him," xxiii. 3, 10, 14. Surely there is nothing in such language as this that can be called "a darkening counsel by meaningless words," or as DELITZSCH says, "a distorting, or perverting, or placing it in a false light."*

In the INTRODUCTION on the THEISM of the book, the opinion is maintained, that the language xlii. 7: "the saying what is right to, or respecting, God," refers solely to Job's humble confession, xlii. 1–6. But certainly those who hold that he is commended for saying what is right in the general discussion, as most commentators do, should hesitate in applying to him reproving words that seem of a directly opposite character, and especially as contrasted with the respectful and encouraging words in the language that immediately follows (ver. 3). It should be remembered, too, that in the whole course of that discussion there is

* The remark of UMBREIT on this language is general: Ein demüthigendes Wort fur die philosophischen Kämpfer! It is most probable, however, that he has Elihu in view, of whom he has a very poor opinion, as a pretentious prattler, although he admits, and gives some very good arguments for, the genuineness of the portion characteristically regarding him as ingeniously designed by the author as a sort of foil to the other speakers.

nothing more noble, more clear, or more commanding the sympathy of the reader, than that eloquent vindication of chap. xxxi. If there is here a reference to it at all it would seem to be, not in the 2d, but in the 3d verse of chap. xxxviii., after the momentary notice of Elihu. This does indeed look like a reminiscence of that pathetic appeal (xxxi. 35): "O that one would hear me." And now the reply comes: "Gird up thy loins now like a man; it is I who ask of thee," not thy dark and erring friends: "It is I," who have come (as the whole purport of the language following warrants us in paraphrasing), not to reveal any plans or counsels, not to solve a problem, or to decide a debate, but "to make my glory to pass before thee,"—not to teach thee my wisdom or skill in nature, but to strengthen thy faith in my Omnipotence: "Fear not, thou worm, Job;" "I am El Shaddai," the Almighty one, stronger than Satan, and all the powers of evil that are permitted to contend with thee, and to try thee so sorely: "*I can do all things*" (xlii. 2); therefore "fear thou not; only believe." One thing further may be remarked under this head: Had the purpose or plan of God been intended by עֵצָה, and not the advice or instruction given by Elihu and the others to Job, it would have been עֲצָתִי, *my counsel*, placing the meaning beyond all doubt, instead of the general term used abstractly. The reference to Isaiah xxvi. 11 (קִנְאַת עָם supposed to be for קנאת עמי) does not bear out the objection of DELITZSCH, since עם is a sufficient limitation of קנאת, preventing of itself any misunderstanding of the idea.

An argument in favor of its being Job who is addressed in ver. 2 might seem to be derived from his own language xlii. 3; but a careful examination renders doubtful any such inference. There is something strange in the way these words are there repeated with a slight change, of מעלים for מחשיך. It does not follow, however, that because in the deep humility of his confession he seems to take them to himself that they were originally so intended. Job takes all to himself. He is the only man among them who makes confession. The words have been ringing in his ears, and now, in his awe-struck, soliloquizing style, he repeats them over to himself, as though conscious alone of his own faults, and having no thought of any other parties: I am the man; it is I, then, "who have uttered what I knew not," "things too great and too wonderful for me." The inference is strengthened from the fact that in a like musing way, like one overwhelmed with the deepest conviction of the divine condescension, he repeats the words of God himself, אשאלך והודיעני, "I will demand of thee and answer thou me." To take these as a demand that Job makes of the Almighty produces utter confusion. Hence some have been led to regard the passage as an interpolation, or a misplacement. But viewed as the language of one in amazement, and talking to himself, as it were, they have a wonderful dramatic force. So CONANT very justly regards "this second member as quoted from the words of the Almighty." We think, however, that he errs in taking them directly here as Job's own language, and giving as their sentiment: "Let me now demand of thee, and be instructed." The objection to it is that no questions follow as really made by Job. This is answered on the unsatisfactory ground that only "the general sentiment was intended." But the dramatic significance is greater on the other view. It is a kind of silent exclamation of amazement: In this new feeling that has come upon him, he says these words over to himself, but as God's own language He utters them just as they were spoken, but to the reader the real feeling and the real significance come through a change of the persons: "THOU ask of me! I answer THEE!" And this it is which prepares us for the language that follows: "I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear,"—that is, I have had traditional knowledge of Thee—"but now mine eye seeth Thee." The new knowledge excels the old, even as the sense of sight excels that of the ear; 'wherefore I reject myself, and repent in dust and ashes."

The view here maintained in respect to the object of xxxviii. 2 is held by LYRA, one of the most judicious of the older commentators: *Sed quis hic reprehenditur?* He answers: *Elihu, quem his verbis tacere jubet; Jobus autem jampridem siluerat.* And so another authority quoted by MERCERUS: *Hunc taxat Deus, vel quod non satis efficaciter Jobum argueret, vel quod, cum homuncio esset, de majestate Dei orsus est agere.*" See POOLE'S SYNOPSIS. Others of the same opinion are referred to by CARYL. It must be admitted, however, that the great majority of commentators refer the words to Job. This is done, of course, by those who

reject the Elihu portion. Even they, however, who admit it (and they are the larger number, if we take into view not only those who hold to its original authenticity, but also men, like DELITZSCH and others, who accept it as canonical, though from a later author), may consistently do so, and yet feel no great difficulty (arising from this intervention) in regarding the divine address as overlooking Elihu, and referring directly back to Job's concluding words, chap. xxxi. The same may be said of the great mass of ordinary readers who know nothing of the critical doubts in relation to this part. Very satisfactory reasons may be given for this. The speech of Elihu seems long from its division into five chapters, and from the mass of commentary with which it has been loaded; but the real time occupied by its utterance could not have exceeded twenty minutes, or half an hour at the utmost. What is of still more importance, Job all this time is the principal figure. A painter of the scene would place him in the foreground, barely distinguishing Elihu, and throwing the others altogether into the shade. Again, although Job is not the last speaker, he is the last one spoken of, and his own hardly suppressed manifestations help to bring him into prominence. Elihu keeps him in view continually. Eight times does he expressly address him by name (xxxiii. 1, 31; xxxiv. 5, 7, 35, 36; xxxv. 16; xxxvii. 14), besides sharp personal appeals in almost every verse. Much of his language intimates an actual part taken by Job, either by way of look, or gesture, or some sign of impatience, as though he was on the point of speaking himself. The critical insight of old CARYL discovers this, and he gives it as a reason for the prompt intervention of the divine voice, silencing Elihu, and preventing that reply on the part of Job which threatened to render the controversy interminable.

Much of what we have thus said may be condemned as conjecture; but, even when thus regarded, it shows how natural this Elihu portion is, and how consistent with the dramatic unity of the book, even if we regard the divine address as wholly overlooking it. A close study, we think, will carry us beyond this, and force the conclusion that it is not only a *consistent*, but a *necessary* part of a work claiming to be a dramatic whole, and that, without it, this "artistic plan and unity" of which "the higher criticism" has so much to say, would be far less easily traced.

THE

BOOK OF JOB.

THEOLOGICALLY AND HOMILETICALLY EXPOUNDED

BY

OTTO ZÖCKLER, D.D.
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT GREIFSWALD.

TRANSLATED AND EDITED

BY

LLEWELYN J. EVANS, D.D.,
PROF. OF BIB. LITERATURE IN LANE THEOL. SEMINARY, CINCINNATI, O.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
743–745 BROADWAY.

PREFACE.

THE exegetical principles which the author has applied in this exposition of the Book of Job require no preliminary statement to be made of them here. They continue to be the same with those which we followed in our exposition of the Solomonic Scriptures, which has already made its appearance in this Series (Vol. X. of the Old Testament), and they rest on the fact, of which we are most firmly convinced, that both as to substance and time the book here treated of belongs to the Literature of Wisdom peculiar to the Solomonic age. That which we have already briefly set forth on this subject in the General Introduction to this group of writings (Vol. X., p. 14 seq.) has been confirmed to our mind by a more thorough examination of the poem as to its contents, form and purpose—except that we have again receded from the hypothesis there presented as an admissible one of its having originated in the age immediately following that of Solomon, and have declared ourselves more unqualifiedly than heretofore in favor of the opinion held at present by the majority of those commentators who believe in revelation, that the book proceeded immediately from the Solomonic epoch. For neither the arguments advanced by a number of critics of the liberal school in favor of the opinion that the book originated in the age of Manasseh, in the first half of the Seventh Century before Christ, nor those advanced by the latest commentator, A. MERX (*Das Gedicht von Hiob; hebr. Text, kritisch bearbeitet und übersebzt, nebst sachlicher und kritischer Einleitung*, Jena, Mauke, 1871, p. 41 seq.), in favor of the closely related hypothesis that it was composed about the year 700 B. C., in the time of Hezekiah, have been able to convince us. The many bold innovations in the line both of textual criticism and of exegetical and Biblical theology which the latter writer has sought in some instances to establish, in others at least to suggest, in respect to the composition, and the scientific treatment of the book, may be of service doubtless in stimulating and advancing the future exegesis of Job in some directions, and especially in the criticism of the text. In general, however, and on the whole, the views which have for years now prevailed in the various circles of commentators on our book, will receive no radical modification from these hypotheses of Merx's, least of all from any which are so thoroughly arbibrary as *e. g.* that which is advanced on p. 44, that ch. xxviii. contains a "concealed polemic" against the Old Testament doctrine of Wisdom (!), or the ingenious, but totally unfounded fancy (p. 100 seq.), that the two animal descriptions in the last discourse of Jehovah (ch. xl. 15—xli. 26 [34]) are to be regarded as being in a measure "Paralipomena to Job," *i. e.* "rejected fragments which had been jotted down by the poet while engaged in the work of production." On this account we cannot indulge in excessive regret that the printing of this exposition having begun as far back as the middle of the present year, and having made slow progress in consequence of various hindrances, it has been practicable to refer to the book of Merx only in a few passages on the last sheets. It has been a cause of more serious regret that of the posthumous work of the sainted Hengstenberg—*Das Buch Hiob erläutert* (Berlin, Schlawitz, 1870)—a manual which is especially valuable for the purposes of practical and homiletic exposition, and which we might class with the most solid exegetical productions of the highly esteemed theologian of Berlin, we have been able to use for comparison only the first half, reaching, so far as the expository part is concerned, to the end of the 14th chapter. With the exception of these two helps, the latest which have appeared, and of some foreign com-

mentaries, which we have been unable to procure, but the omission of which can scarcely be regarded as an important deficiency in the prosecution of our work, all the modern and latest exegetical literature on the subject has been consulted by us with due care, and that portion of it which is of special value has been examined and compared with the utmost possible thoroughness. At the same time we have not allowed this dependence on our predecessors to prejudice in any degree the independence of our own conclusions, as may be seen, *e. g.*, in the position we have taken respecting the discourses of Elihu, which, notwithstanding the opposition of many moderns, we cannot otherwise than regard as an integral constituent of the poem according to its original construction.

May this work, of the deficiencies of which no one can be more sensible than we are, be not altogether barren of fruit as a contribution to the exposition and to the seasonable application of the oldest "Cross and Comfort-book" of God's people! May it be valued as to some degree a useful help in particular to that class of Scripture students who, while they do not blindly surrender themselves to certain traditional prejudices of the modern critical theology, labor with unfeigned zeal for the reconciliation of faith in the Bible revelation with the verified results of the scientific investigations of the day, especially into the questions which concern the history of religion and civilization!

DR. ZÖCKLER.

GREIFSWALD. *November*, 1871.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

INTRODUCTION.

§1. NAME AND CONTENTS OF THE BOOK.

THE name which our Book has borne from antiquity, and without any variation whatever on the part of the sources by which it has been transmitted, is that of its principal hero —*Job* [Hebrew אִיּוֹב, Germ. *Hiob*, of which, however, Dr. Zöckler remarks that it less accurately represents the Heb. than the form *Job* (Ijob, Ijjob)]. This name is no free poetic invention of the author, but without doubt a proper name assigned to him by primitive tradition, the name of a particular person belonging to the history or the legend. The supposition that it was the product of poetic fiction on the part of the author is contradicted by the circumstance that the book nowhere contains any allusion to the signification of the name, notwithstanding that the religious and ethical tendency of the book, and especially its aim, which is rightly to explain and to justify the suffering which overtakes innocence, would have furnished abundant occasion for such allusions. It is to be sure a question how the name is to be etymologically explained; whether, with most expositors, ancient and modern, we form it after the Hebrew, in which case אִיּוֹב would seem to be a passive participle from אָיַב (Ex. xxiii. 22), and to signify accordingly "the assailed, persecuted one," or with some of the moderns, we base it on the Arabic verb שׁוּב=אוּב, with the signification, "he who turns around, who repents, who returns to God." But whichever of these two significations, which are equally admissible, may be the original one, the poet would have had opportunity enough to introduce some reference to it if it had lain at all within his plan to make such allusions, or even if a moralizing nomenclature had belonged to the circle of his vision and to his individual poetic style. For in the other names of his book as well, whether of persons, or of countries, or of races, he abstains wholly from all such attempts at etymological characterization. Whence it is sufficiently apparent that the name of the hero, which has given name to the entire book, has its origin in a concrete historical tradition.

The *Theme* and *Contents* of the book are briefly as follows:

Ch. i.—ii.: The *Prologue*, or the *Historical Introduction* to the poem. Job, an inhabitant of the land of Uz, noted for his piety, riches and position, being accused before God by Satan, is, in accordance with the divine decree, subjected to a severe trial. A series of sudden calamities robs him in a very short time of his possessions, his children, and his health, and in an instant plunges him, afflicted with the most terrible species of leprosy, elephantiasis, from the height of earthly prosperity into the deepest misery. He endures this visitation, however, with wonderful equanimity; and even when his wife, overcome by doubt, urges him to renounce God, he allows no blasphemous, nor even an impatient word to pass from his lips.—Three friends of Job, Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar, who come to visit him from sympathy, are so powerfully affected at the sight of his misery, that for seven days and nights they sit down with the sorely afflicted man in silence, without giving him a word of comfort.

Ch. iii.—xxxi.: *The Dialogue*, or the *dialectic discussion* of the problem. Job, having at last himself broken the long silence by a violent outburst, beginning with a curse on the day of his birth (Ch. iii.: Theme, or immediate occasion of the dialogue) there springs up

a long colloquy between him and his three visitors in respect to the question whether his suffering is unmerited, or whether it has come upon him as the just punishment of his sins. The friends maintain the latter; they defend the position that God never imposes suffering otherwise than by way of retribution for particular moral offenses and transgressions of His law; and they accordingly urge on the sorely afflicted man in a tone now of milder, now of more violent accusation, the necessity of knowing himself and turning to God in true penitence. Job, on the contrary, finds no connection whatever between his suffering and his guilt, declares himself to be conscious of no sin at all by which he could have incurred such calamity; he even goes so far as to utter violent, almost desperate accusations against God, in that he doubts His justice, and represents himself as innocently persecuted by Him. Presently, however, he rises to a state of greater calmness and composure, when, supported by the consciousness of his innocence, and at the same time humbly submitting himself beneath the inscrutable dispensations of the wise and just God, he declares his purpose faithfully and reverently to cleave to Him, while he none the less expresses his yearning hope for a manifestation of God, in which, as he distinctly anticipates, He will bring to light his innocence, and restore him out of his misery.—The colloquy runs through *three series of discourses* (Ch. iv.–xiv.; Ch. xv.–xxi.; Ch. xxii.–xxxi.), which exhibit in each successive stage a heightening of the conflict between the friends as his accusers, and Job as he replies to them one by one. Especially do the discourses in which Eliphaz arraigns Job, which open each new Act [or Series], indicate an advance in the direction of more and more direct assaults on the personal character of the sufferer, and stronger suspicions of his innocence. The discourses of Bildad and Zophar are in each instance shorter than those of Eliphaz. In the third series of discourses (Ch. xxii. seq.) Zophar no longer takes part in the colloquy; but Job, having forcibly repelled the assaults of Eliphaz and Bildad (Ch. xxiii., xxiv., and Ch. xxvi.–xxviii.), proceeds in a kind of *appended monologue* (Ch. xxix.–xxxi.), elaborately contrasting with an apologetic purpose his former and present condition, continually asserting his innocence in the most emphatic language, and expressing his firm confidence in the final interposition of God for his vindication; and thus he holds the field victorious over all the assaults of his adversaries.

Ch. xxxii.—xxxvii.: The discourses of Elihu, or *the attempt to settle the controversy by means of human wisdom.*—A fourth opponent of Job now makes his appearance, *Elihu*, inferior to the former three in age, but not in wisdom and eloquence. He seeks to show that Job in his vindication was guilty of great one-sidedness in totally repudiating any guilt on his part, and in casting doubt on God's justice by representing himself as cruelly tormented and persecuted without cause. He censures the polemic of the friends against Job as inadequate and inconsequential, recognizes him as the victor, who has reduced them to silence; but having done this, he controverts his right to utter accusations and doubts against God's justice, seeks to glorify this cardinal attribute of God by showing that He, moved not by anger, but by love, often decrees suffering for His human children with a view to chasten and purify them, and admonishes him to submit reverently and humbly under all dispensations of the Most High, whose wondrous power and majesty he most vividly describes and extols at the end of his discourse.

Ch. xxxviii.—xlii.: *The Divine decision*, or *God's judgment in respect to the contending parties*, together with the *historical epilogue, or closing act.* The exhibitions of one-sidedness, which characterize this attempt of a human arbiter to mediate in the controversy, serve to set forth in its proper light the appearance of God on the scene, the way for which has now been sufficiently prepared. Jehovah appears, and in a powerful discourse addressed to Job out of a storm shows (ch. xxxviii.—xli.) that it is folly to doubt His wisdom and justice in ruling the destinies of men on earth, and for this reason, that to the man who utters such doubt not even the simplest, commonest processes in the external life of nature are clear and comprehensible, at the same time that in those processes those Divine attributes are supremely and most gloriously revealed. With this exposition, which is directed more especially against Job, is connected the condemnation of the three friends on account of their short-sighted, harsh, unfriendly view of the relation in which he stood to the Divine righteousness.

Still more emphatic is the condemnation which follows in *the final scene of the whole*, which is introduced by Job's penitential confession of his sin (ch. xlii.), this condemnation being pronounced first of all formally and directly by requiring of them a definite expiation of their offense, and by God's declaration that He graciously accepted Job's intercession in their behalf, and then circumstantially in the fact that Job's prosperity, dignity and honor are restored, and that his earthly possessions are given back to him two-fold. The problem of the book thus seems to meet with a solution that is sufficiently profound, and the sufferings of the pious Job are an example and a demonstration of the existence of sufferings which are essentially designed to prove, test, purify and establish the innocence of the righteous ones on whom they fall.

Note.—The orthography *Hiob*, first introduced by Luther in his German translation, was intended simply to hinder the word from being pronounced with a consonantal J (comp. Hebr. יוֹב, Gen. xlvi. 13), and to indicate the presence of an aspirate at the beginning of the dissyllable. But inasmuch as this א at the beginning of the word does not according to our notions constitute an audible breathing, and since it serves rather to make more prominent that internal consonantal Yodh-sound, which the Daghesh in the second radical expresses, the word is, with Ewald, Dillmann, and other moderns, to be written *Ijob* [Engl. *Iyob*]. (The form *Ijjob* [or *Iyyob*] would involve a needless hardening of that consonantal Yodh, as well as a useless pleonasm, such as would be *e. g.* the rendering of דָּנִיֵּאל by Daniyyel.) We come near enough, however, to the Hebrew sound of the name if we adhere to the Ἰώβ of the Greek and the Job of the Latin Bible, with a correct pronunciation of the initial sound.—As respects the etymology of אִיּוֹב, the attempt of the LXX. to identify this name and its dependents with that of the Edomite prince יוֹבָב, a grandson of Esau (Gen. xxxvi. 33), may be set aside as etymologically impossible and historically undemonstrable (comp. § 2). The two explanations given above in the text are the only ones that deserve more minute minute consideration. Of these the second, which finds the basis of the word in the Arab. אוב, "to turn" (of which the Heb. אָיַב is only a dialectic variation) might seem to deserve the preference for the following reasons: 1. Because in any case Job's final turning, conversion to God, constituted an original characteristic feature of Job's conduct and destiny. 2. A specifically Hebrew etymon of the name seems to be less in harmony with the position and ethnographical peculiarities of the land of Uz. 3. The form אִיּוֹב, from אָיַב, "to treat hostilely," judging by the analogy of most such formations as follow קָטּוֹל, should have not a passive, but an active sense (comp. Ewald, *Lehrb.* § 155, *c*). 4. Finally, such a form, if in fact expressing the passive meaning, "the assailed, persecuted one," seems to express the thought too indefinitely, because the essential thought that the hostile treatment was "from God" is not also expressed. Influenced by these arguments, Kromayer, J. D. Michaelis, Bertholdt, Eichhorn, Rosenmüller among the older commentators, Ewald, Delitzsch, Dillmann, *etc.*, among the latest, have preferred to explain the name after the Arabic, partly with a reference to the Koran, in which (Sur. 38, ver. 40) the Job of the Old Testament history is introduced by the designation "the returning, the repentant" one. The passage referred to, however, scarcely suffices to establish this explanation beyond question, for: (*a*) That passage of the Koran (vers. 16 and 29) applies the same predicate—"the one turning, or changing himself"—to David and Solomon. (*b*) The suffering which the hero of our book endures seems far more characteristic of him than the final change which takes place in him. (c) The notion of "being assailed, persecuted," assigned to אִיּוֹב, does not need to be supplemented by the clause—"on the part of God"—seeing that the sufferings of our hero proceeded in no small degree from the hostility of men, and most of all from that of his best friends. (*d*) That the language of Uz, the land of Job's nativity, was predominantly Arabic, is by no means an established fact, but is on the contrary at variance with the decidedly Hebrew cast of the other proper names in the book, and especially those of the three daughters of Job (ch. xlii. 14). (*e*) The use of words in the form קָטּוֹל in Hebrew with a passive signification is supported by some weighty examples, especially יִלּוֹד, "born." It will be seen accordingly that there is a series of strong arguments to justify the explanation of the word in accordance with the Hebrew etymology, as explained by Gesenius, Fürst, de Wette, Umbreit, Hirzel, Heiligstedt, Hävernick, Davidson (*Introduction*, Vol. II., p. 174) [Hengstenberg, Noyes, A. B. Davidson, Carey, Schlottmann, Wordsworth, Rodwell], *etc.* The theory that the name is fictitious, and intentionally denotes a purely allegorical character is disproved by either one of the two definitions in question, and still more by the considerations to be adduced in the sequel in favor of the historical reality of the principal persons and facts of the narrative.

§ 2. THE HISTORICAL MATERIAL OF THE BOOK.

From the above exhibition of the contents and course of thought in the book it is clear that it is *no mere fiction*, as has been frequently maintained from early times (first by R. Resh Lakish in the *Talmud*, *Baba bathra*, fol. xv. 1; then by Maimonides, Salmasius, Le Clerc, J. D. Michaelis, Dathe, Bertholdt, Bernstein, Augusti, Bruno Bauer [Reuss, Merx], *etc.*). This theory, that the material of the narrative had its origin in the author's imagination, is disproved by the following considerations, in addition to the concrete historical character which attaches to the name Job, as well as to the names of the other chief personages of the story.—1. The fact that the country where the scene of the action is laid, the land of Uz, did not stand in close connection with Israel, and that no other reason can well be assigned for the choice of this particular country than the fact of its having been already designated by a

definite historical tradition; especially seeing that a purely fictitious investiture corresponding to the spirit and character of the action, which, while it is not indeed theocratic, is nevertheless intensely religious and specifically monotheistic, would have much more naturally suggested some Israelitish locality.* 2. The fact that it must have been important for the author to illustrate the lofty truth to be demonstrated by an example, the historical reality of which could not have been denied by his contemporaries; or, in other words, that a purely parabolical dress would have been very ill-suited to the religious and didactic purpose by which he was governed. 3. The fact that the setting forth of pure invention as actual history would be, according to the correct observation of Ewald and Dillmann, "entirely foreign to the spirit of early antiquity, and moreover entirely superfluous in view of the great abundance of legends, which were then accessible." 4. Finally, the mention of Job, along with Noah and Daniel in the book of Ezekiel (ch. xiv. 14–20); a mention which by no means rests solely on the text of our book, but which assuredly proceeds from the desire to name three characters in the circle of sacred history famed for their wisdom and piety (comp. my *Bearbeitung des Proph. Daniel*, p. 11 seq.), and which accordingly is a direct attestation to the historical reality of the person of our hero, a proof which, on account of the pre-exilic antiquity of the prophecies of Ezekiel, is stronger than that furnished by the later allusions to the history of Job in the Book of Tobit (ch. ii. 12, 15), and in the Epistle of James (ch. v. 11).

These arguments for the historical verity of the narrative are indeed far from sufficient to prove that in every particular it is to be regarded as *veritable history*, and that this book is accordingly to be taken altogether out of the class of the poetical products of the Old Testament Literature, and to be assigned to the class of historical books. This crude opinion, ruthlessly destructive as it is of the poetic character of the book, has found defenders from the time of the Alexandrian translators, whose attempt at identifying Job with Jobab (Gen. xxxvi. 33), the son of Zerah, and the grandson of Esau (see the Appendix to Job xlii. 17, at the end of Comm'y.: *προϋπῆρχεν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ 'Ιωβάβ. 'Ην δὲ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ Ζαρέθ, κ. τ. λ.*) rests on that sort of an exaggerated historical view of the historic material of the book. So according to all appearance Josephus (*c. Apion.* I. 8); and so in like manner many Rabbis, and Church Fathers, and more particularly in modern times the orthodox Reformed of the 16th and 17th Centuries, as *e. g.*, Fr. Spanheim, whose *Historia Jobi* (Opp. T. II., p. 1703) took the ground that only by maintaining the historical reality of the contents of the book can the author be vindicated against the charge of a fraudulent invention (*in historia sit, fraus scriptoris*); also the celebrated orientalist Alb. Schultens, in Leyden, who endeavored to show that the book is a true narrative, relating a colloquy of ancient Eastern sages in the poetic improvisatory style of the Arabian tales. The principal reasons which may be urged against this extreme historical theory are the following: 1. The plan and purpose of the whole book, which on the one side resembles a drama, on the other a philosophical dialogue (comp. § 3). 2. The scene in heaven with which the story begins (ch. i. 6 seq.), which like the theophany in ch. v. 38 seq., could be regarded as historic only in the sense of a history characterized by strong idealization. 3. The poetic completeness of the discourses, which, notwithstanding all that may be alleged respecting their affinity to the proverbial discourses which the Arabian sages improvised in poetic form, with those *e. g.* found in the celebrated *Consessus* of the Hariri, bear nevertheless the impress of an earnest, not to say laborious artistic effort, and of which Luther without doubt said truly in his Table-Talk: "People do not talk that way in temptation." 4. The poetic transparency and intentional regularity of the relations and facts which are described, as shown by comparing the introductory verses

* Hengstenberg (*Beiträge zur Einl. ins. A. T.*, II. 302 seq.) explains the course of the Israelitish author of the book in placing the action in a foreign land, on the ground that it is his purpose "to solve the problem from the standpoint of that knowledge of God which prevails among men universally and outside of the theocracy." This is not incorrect in so far as it is in fact very obviously the poet's aim to stamp an extra-Israelitish character on the whole action and discussion (comp. § 5, together with the Note). But to say that from beginning to end he invented his material, that he imagined a pious man like Job, belonging to the heathen land of Uz, a personality such as in fact could not have existed within the bounds of heathenism, this is a supposition improbable in itself, which has no points of support in the book itself, and no analogies in the remaining religious literature of that remote antiquity.

of the prologue with the concluding verses of the epilogue. (Observe in particular the exact doubling of Job's former possessions in cattle, according to ch. xlii. 12, as also the round numbers in the same passage, and in vers. 13 and 16). 5. The sublime profundity of the religious and ethical problem treated of in the book, and the impressive power of the truths brought forward to aid in its solution; and in general the ideal beauty of the whole, which cannot possibly be explained apart from the reflective and artistically creative activity of a poetic genius endowed in unusual measure by the Spirit of God.

We are left accordingly to that view which has of late met with such wide, and indeed almost exclusive acceptance, which assumes along with a historic kernel, a free poetic treatment by the author of the material derived from the ancient legend, a treatment which invests such material with great depth and beauty. It is precisely the view which Luther expressed in his Table-Talk: "I hold that the book of Job is a true history, which was afterwards put into a poem; and that what is here said happened to a man, although not precisely according to the words which are here recorded." And modern writers (Jahn, Döderlein, Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Umbreit, Vaihinger, Ewald, Hirzel, Dillmann, Delitzsch, Davidson [Schlottmann, Canon Cook in Smith's Bib. Dict., and in Bible (Speaker's) Commentary; McClintock & Strong's Cyclopædia, Art. "Job;" Princeton Review, Vol. XXIX., p. 284], *etc.*, have discussed this view, and argued in favor of it at length. Just where the historical kernel ceases, and the poetic vesture begins, it would be impossible precisely to define. This difficulty is especially due to the fact that the material which served the poet for his creative use was not history in the strict sense of the word, but history which had passed through the channels of legendary tradition, and also to the fact that there were no variations of the legend, of equal value and approximating a like antiquity with that which lies at the basis of our book.* All that can with much probability be assumed to be true is that along with the person, the abode, and the surroundings of Job, the fact of the sudden overthrow of his prosperity and of his pious constancy in adversity had been transmitted to the poet by the legend. Still further, the nature of the calamities which had overtaken him, and particularly of his bodily suffering, may well have been a part of the historical tradition. So correctly Ewald, Heiligstedt, Hirzel, Hävernick, *etc.*, against Hahn, Hengstenberg, Schlottmann, Davidson and others, who needlessly think that the poet represents his hero as afflicted with elephantiasis for the simple reason that of all the diseases known to him this was the most horrible and loathsome. Had there been any variation in the ancient tradition respecting the nature and characteristics of Job's disease, such an opinion might be regarded as having more definite support. But in view of the fact that we have only one source of information, it cannot be doubted that the nature of the disease from which the pious patriarch suffered is also to be taken as a part of the original tradition.

In respect to the *age* of Job, many conjectures have been indulged in since that gloss of the Septuagint which represented him as a contemporary of the sons of Jacob, or rather of Joseph, and thus as belonging to the pre-Mosaic period. In accordance with that intimation, he has been assigned to the period intervening between the age of Joseph and that of Moses (Chrysostom, Carpzovius, Lightfoot [Carey, Lee], *etc.;* or still later as an early contemporary of Moses (Kennicott, *Remarks on Select Passages of Scripture*, p. 152) [Wordsworth]; or even to the pre-Abrahamic period (*e. g.* Hales, *Analysis of Sacred Chronology*, II. 53 seq., where an attempt is made, on the basis of astronomic computations, to determine the year 2130 B. C., or 818 after the flood, as the time of Job's affliction and trial of his constancy); or finally he has been assigned to the post-patriarchal and post-Mosaic age, as a

* That the Koran furnishes traditional intelligence about Job (comp. Note on § 1), that in consequence thereof families of distinction among the ancient Arabians were wont to give the nsme Job to those connected with them, or to boast of their descent from the pious patriarch of that name, that in Arabia down to the Fourth Century of our era the supposed grave of the pious sufferer was the scene of religious pilgrimages and observances, and that even in modern times not less than *six* different places in the East have pnt forth claims to be the genuine burial-places of Job (comp. Jahn, *Einleitung*, II. 761 seq.; Winer, *Reallexikon*, I. 493; J. C. Wetstein in the Appendix to Delitzsch's Commy.; G. Flügel, *Hiob bei den Muhamedanern* in Ersch & Gruber's *Encyclopädie*)—all this of course deserves no consideration as a means of enlarging or elucidating our historical information concerning Job. Of just as little value in this respect is the long appendix to ch. xlii. 17 found in the LXX.

contemporary of the Judges, or of Solomon, or of Nebuchadnezzar, or of Ezra, *etc.* (comp. below § 5, the remarks on the time when the book was composed). It is evident that most of these attempts at determining the time, and especially those which presuppose the absolute historical reality of the material, without any legendary or poetic drapery, are altogether arbitrary. It may be urged, however, in general that the following reasons make it probable that Job lived and suffered *in the time of the patriarchs*, and consequently before Moses:

1. The extreme age, extending far beyond one hundred and forty years, to which he lived, according to ch. xlii. 16.

2. The mention of the gold coin, קְשִׂיטָה (ch. xlii. 11), with which we are made acquainted through the histories of Jacob and Joshua (Gen. xxxiii. 19; Josh. xxiv. 32), which is the only coin anywhere mentioned in the book, and which is accordingly a witness to the probability that it belongs to the patriarchal age.

3. The mention of the musical instruments, עוּגָב, flute, כִּנּוֹר, guitar, and תֹּף, tymbal (ch. xxi. 12; xxx. 31), the only instruments recognized in Genesis (Gen. iv. 21; xxxi. 27), which accordingly are of the most ancient sort.

4. The mention—which also carries us back into the age of Genesis—of writing on stone, by means of an iron stylus, or chisel (ch. xix. 23 seq.); along with which, indeed in the same passage, and in ch. xxxi. 35, mention is also made of writing on parchment or in a book (כתב בספר), a mode of writing, however, which indisputably belongs to the pre-Mosaic age, as a glance at the monuments of Ancient Egypt will show.

5. The act of Job in officiating as priest in the family circle, offering an atoning sacrifice (ch. i. 5), which reminds us decidedly of the same act on the part of Noah (Gen. viii. 20), and of Jacob (Gen. xxxv. 2; comp. on the other side Ex. xix. 10; Num. xi. 18; Josh. vii. 13).

6. The number seven, which was so characteristic of the worship of antiquity, and which appears in the bullocks and rams offered by Job (comp. ch. xlii. 8 with Num. xxiii. 1; also Gen. vii. 2 seq; viii. 19 seq., *etc.*).

7. The reference, characteristic of the religious physiognomy of the pre-Mosaic age, to the idolatrous adoration of the sun and moon, and to the worship of the stars, or Sabaism (see ch. xxxi. 26; and comp. Deut. iv. 19; xvii. 3).

These are the arguments which are usually urged to prove that Job was a contemporary of the pre-Mosaic patriarchs. Granting that some of them, particularly those cited under 6 and 7, are of less force, and are equally applicable to a later period, they yield in the main a considerable degree of probability that the time fixed on above is approximately correct. An approximate estimate, however, is all that can be reached by such an investigation into the age of a point of history wrapped in the mist of a poetic legend. Comp. still further our remarks on the concluding verses of the Epilogue, ch. xlii. 12-17, where additional traces may be found of Job's having belonged to the patriarchal age.

§ 3. THE POETIC ART-FORM OF THE BOOK.

The task which lay before the author as respects the artistic treatment of his material, was essentially two-fold. *First* he was to put his material in narrative form, in a style of poetic description, elevating and transfiguring the concrete historic fact into the ideal truth of transactions of eternal significance. *Next* he was to discuss reflectively the problem which constitutes the religious and ethical kernel of those transactions, touching the possibility and the divinely ordained purpose of unmerited suffering on the part of men. The first part of his task he accomplishes in the sections of prose narrative, the *Prologue* and the *Epilogue*, which open and close the book. The second part receives the author's attention in the *discourses* of the book, which are far more extensive and elaborate, which in form and language are thoroughly poetic, and in which alone direct expression is given to that which is obviously the scope and purpose of the work as a whole—the discourses, to wit, of Job, of his three friends, of Elihu, and also of Jehovah, who personally appears to give to the conflict its final solution. These discourses exhibit to the last detail a high degree of elaboration and poetic art. The opening discourse by Job in ch. iii., which contains the theme of the discussion,

belongs to the *preparatory* part of the book, in which the foundations of the problem are laid down, in connection with the introductory information conveyed by the Prologue concerning the events which befel Job, and the supra-mundane occasions of the same as consisting in God's permissive agency and Satan's agency as tempter (chs. i., ii.). The discourses of Job's three friends, or rather opponents, together with the replies which the object of their attacks makes to each one individually (ch. iv.–xxviii.), carry on the *entanglement* of the conflict to be described. This consists in a three-fold series of unjust accusations of Job, proceeding from the standpoint of an external and one-sided conception of the legal doctrine of retribution, corresponding to which we have a series of arguments by Job, which are not less one-sided, which in part are violently passionate and morally unsound, in which he asserts his innocence, and casts suspicions on the justice of God's ways. Job himself prepares the way for the final *solution* of the conflict in the exhibition which he makes of genuine theocratic piety in the *monologue* appended to the three acts of the colloquy, where he appears as one who has been brought back to a more thoughtful appreciation of his condition, and for that same reason as triumphing over the reproaches of his three friends (ch. xxix.–xxxi.; comp. above p. 6). The solution receives its completion indeed only in the three following stages of the conclusion; the *first* of which is signalized by the appearance of Elihu, who exhibits the utmost that *human* wisdom can contribute by way of answer to the difficult questions which arise in respect to the significance of the sufferings of the innocent (ch. xxxii.–xxxvii.); the *second* by the long address of Jehovah to Job which sets forth the adjudication of the point in controversy in accordance with the *divine* point of view, the argument here being general in its character (ch. xxxviii.–xli.); the *third* finally by the concrete actual decision rendered between the contending parties by the distribution of punishment and reward to the one and the other respectively (ch. xlii.).*

According to the views here expressed, it may seem doubtful with which of the varieties of poetry familiar and current among ourselves this book should be classified; for it evidently exhibits characteristics which belong to several. In its Prologue and Epilogue we find the objective description and the childlike *naïveté* in narrative which distinguish the *epic* style. Not a few parts of the discourses have a *lyric*, and in particular an *elegiac* tone. In its special object and its general scope, it is indisputably *didactic*. But it is as a *drama*, more especially a drama pre-eminently earnest in tone and pervaded by a religious philosophy as to its contents, as a tragedy of religious philosophy, that it exhibits itself at first sight to

* Such in substance is the plan of the poem as conceived by most moderns, who maintain the genuineness of Elihu's discourses, especially Hahn, p. 4 seq.; Delitzsch, I., p. 15; Schlottmann, p. 20 seq. If the genuineness of the discourses referred to be controverted, the analysis of the whole poem would receive only *one* unessential modification, to wit, that one of the constituents which prepare the way for the final solution must be omitted, a constituent, however, which is highly conspicuous and influential. Compare *e. g.* the following analysis by Dillmann (p. xviii. seq.), which is on the whole closely related to that given above: "Forasmuch as the history here set forth is the history of a controversy, the whole resolves itself into three divisions: the opening, the entanglement, the solution.—In the *opening* of the problem (ch. i.–iii.); the piety and the prosperity of the hero are briefly set forth, a glance is given at a transaction taking place in heaven between God and Satan, in which a decision is formed affecting Job's destiny, and then in rapid succession are described the calamities which swept away his prosperity, and the believing resignation of the sufferer, which does not give way under the sneers of his wife, and which only after the advent of the three friends and their gloomy silence is driven into an expression of captious complaint and doleful despair.—The *entanglement* (ch. iv.–xxviii.), by virtue of the fact that the friends now enter into a colloquy with Job, shapes itself into a controversial discussion between him and them. On the part of Job, however, this discussion reveals at the same time an inward soul-struggle, in which he must work his way up out of the errors of superstition and unbelief back again to sobriety of thought and a right belief. Not until he has brought his faith and his religion out of this struggle, not only unharmed, but inwardly strengthened, can the *solution* follow. Here we have, as the first step, the hero on whom the burden of his sad destiny still presses heavily, setting forth in a long discourse, or soliloquy, the perplexing enigma, that he should have been cast down out of his former state of favor and prosperity into his present misery, although he could solemnly affirm that he had not permitted himself any, not even the slightest departure from God's ways in thought, word or deed, and earnestly yearning for a ray of divine light, and for deliverance (ch. xxix.–xxxi.). Whereupon God then appears to the tried sufferer, at first, however, only in order, through the majesty of His divine appearance, and His lofty divine discourse, to lead him freely and voluntarily to take back and repent of his presumptuous sinful speeches, which he had delivered in the heat of the struggle (ch. xxxviii.–xlii. 6). Only when thus humbled and purified by penitence, does God now expressly vindicate him as against the friends, deliver him, and endow him anew with greater prosperity (ch. xlii. 7–17). This decision in actual life carries with it also the solution of the theoretical questions involved: it is proved that even an innocent man may suffer for his own good, and for the furtherance of his spiritual life."—So also Ewald in his elaborate exhibition of the inward progress of the poem (p. 25 seq.).

him who regards its plan as a whole and its arrangement, the division of its principal dialogue into three acts or movements, the increase of the entanglement toward the end, and the purely dramatic solution by the appearance and judicial intervention of God Himself. No wonder therefore that the attempt has been made to subject the poem in a one-sided and exclusive manner to one or another of these classifications. It has been viewed as an *epic* poem by Stuss (*De Epopœia Jobæa, Commentatt.* III., Goth., 1753), Lichtenstein (*Num liber Jobi cum Odyssea Homeri comparari possit*, Helmst., 1773), Ilgen (*Jobi antiquissimi carminis hebraici natura atque virtus*, Lips., 1789), Augusti (*Einleitung ins A. Test.*, p. 268), Good (*Version of Job, Introductory Dissertation*, sect. 2), *etc.* Its *lyric* character has been specially emphasized by Stuhlmann, Keil (the former of whom calls it a "religious poem," the latter a "lyric aphoristic poem"), and several others; while J. D. Michaelis (who in his *Prolegomena zum Hiob* endeavors with unusual zeal to exhibit the practical utility of the doctrinal contents of this "moral poem"), Herder (who calls it the "most ancient and exalted didactic poem of all nations"), and others, look at it chiefly in the light of a *didactic* poem; so also Diedrich (*Das B. Hiob kurz erklärt, etc.*, Leipzig, 1858), who calls it a "parable" (against which see Vilmar, *Past.-theolog. Blatt.*, Vol. XI., p. 59 seq.). The book was already recognized as a *drama* by Luther, who after his homely striking fashion says of it: "It is just like what you see in a play;" and by Leibnitz, whom it strikes as being a musical drama, as being indeed altogether operatic (comp. Schmidt's *Zeitschr. f. Geschichte*, 1847, for May, p. 436); so also Brentius, Joh. Gerhard, Beza, Mercier, Cocceius, and others, who have spoken of it as a "tragedy," and have undertaken to compare with it those works of Æschylus and Sophocles, which describe conflicts similar to those of our book carried on by suffering heroes against the dark powers of destiny, or against the wrath of the gods (thus recently A. Vogel in the Inaugural Dissertation: *Quid de fato senserint Judæi et Græci, Jobo et Sophocli Philoctete probatur*, Gryphisw. 1869, in which an interesting parallel is drawn between Job and Philoctetes). Most moderns also recognize this dramatic character, especially Umbreit (Introd. to his Commy., p. xxxiii.), Ewald who calls it "the divine drama of the ancient Hebrews" (*Dichter des A. Bundes*, III. p. 56), Hupfeld (*Deutsche Zeitschr. f. christliche Wissenschaft*, 1850, No. 35 seq.), Davidson (*Introduction to the O. T.*, II., p. 179), Delitzsch (Art. "Job" in Herzog's *Realencykl.* VI., p. 123 [and Commy I., p. 15 seq. See also Schlottmann, p. 40 seq.; A. B. Davidson, I., p. 16 seq.; Lowth, Lectures XXXII.—XXXIV.; Dillmann, Introd. to Commy., p. 21; Froude, *Westminster Review*, 1853, reprinted in *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, p. 228 seq.]). The objections urged to this view by G. Baur (*Das B. Hiob und Dante's Göttl Komödie, eine Parallele*, in the *Studd u Kritiken*, 1856, Part. III.) are valid only in so far as they deny that the poem was intended for actual scenic representation, and thus justify the use of the word drama only in the wider sense, that of an epico-dramatic poem, of the same class with Dante's masterpiece.* In this more general sense, however, it deserves beyond question, and with scarcely less right than the Song of Solomon, to be called a drama; especially seeing that it introduces characters which are clearly defined and sharply discriminated, and consistently maintains their several individualities down to the final absolute adjudication by God. Even the attempt to exhibit in detail the principal scenes or acts of this epic or didactic religious drama, which Deliizsch has made (I., p. 15), cannot be condemned, so far at least as the principle is concerned. That writer, agreeing

* [The same may be said of the criticisms of Renan, Hengstenberg and Merx, which otherwise are interesting and suggestive. "The Shemites," says the former, "were unacquainted with those species of poetry which are founded on the development of an action, the epopee, the drama, as well as with those forms of speculation which are founded on the experimental or rational method, philosophy, science. Their poetry is the canticle; their philosophy is the parable (*Mashal*). Their style lacks the period, as their thought lacks the syllogism. Enthusiasm, and reflection as well, express themselves with them in brief and vivid strokes, for which it is needless to seek anything analogous in the rhetorical arrangement of the Greeks and the Latins. The poem of Job is beyond contradiction the most ancient *chef-d'œuvre* of that rhetoric, as on the contrary the Koran is the specimen which stands nearest to us. We must abandon all comparison between forms of treatment and movement so far removed from our taste, and the solid and continuous texture of classic works. The action, the regular march of the thought, which are the life of Greek compositions, are here wanting entirely. But a vivacity of imagination, a force of concentrated passion, to which nothing can be compared, shoot forth, if I may say so, into a thousand scintillations, and make every line a discourse or a thesis (*philosophème*) complete in itself." *Le Livre de Job*, introductory *Etude*, p. 63 seq.]

substantially with the arrangement and partition of the poem, which we have given above, distinguishes *eight* parts, or acts of the dramatic action, as follows:

1. Chap. i.—iii.: The opening [*Anknüpfung*, which may also be rendered: The tying of the knot].
2. Chap. iv.—xiv.: The first course of the controversy; or the entanglement beginning.
3. Chap. xv.—xxi.: The second course of the controversy; or the entanglement increasing.
4. Chap. xxii.—xxvi.: The third course of the controversy; or the entanglement at its height.
5. Chap. xxvii.—xxxi.: The transition from the entanglement to the unravelment (from the δέσις to the λύσις): Job's monologues.
6. Chap. xxxii.—xxxvii.: The completion of the transition from the δέσις to the λύσις; the discourses of Elihu.
7. Chap. xxxviii.—xlii. 6: The unravelment in the consciousness.
8. Chap. xlii. 7—17: The unravelment in outward reality.

In this enumeration of eight acts too little prominence is given to the *threefold division* on which the author unmistakably founds his arrangement of the book, and that intentionally, a division which is observable not only in the three movements of the colloquy between Job and his friends, but also in the threefold groups of discourses which follow, to wit, those of Job, of Elihu, and of Jehovah (on this triadic arrangement of the poem comp. Baur, *l. c.*, p. 642 seq.). [" The ruling number *three* is most visible in all its parts. (1) The whole book falls into three sections: Prologue, Poem, Epilogue. (2) The poem strictly, also into three parts: Job and the Friends, Elihu, God. (3) The discussion between Job and the friends again into three cycles. (4) Each cycle falls into three pairs: Eliphaz and Job, Bildad and Job, Zophar and Job; only in the last cycle Zophar fails to appear, and Job speaks twice. (5) Job sustains three temptations. (6) Elihu makes three speeches. (7) And, finally, very many of the speeches fall into three strophes" A. B. Davidson.—To which add that in the interim between the controversy with the friends, and the appearance of Elihu, Job utters three monologues]. For this reason it is more correct to regard the two epic narrative sections, the Prologue and Epilogue (1 and 8 according to Delitzsch), as standing outside of the partition of the poem proper, and forming, as it were, only its outer frames. We shall then have for the dramatic kernel of the whole (chap. iii.—xli.) *six* scenes or acts, the same number which Delitzsch has assumed for the Canticles (see Vol. X. of the Old Testament Series in this Comm'y., p. vi., of Introd. to Cant.). Comp. below, § 11, the more detailed outline of the contents.

It must not of course be forgotten in this connection that our book is an essentially *oriental* poem, exhibiting only an incomplete and partial analogy to the various forms of poetic art produced by the classic nations of the West. Draw if you will a parallel, reaching to the minutest detail, between the most famous products of the ancient, and of the modern occidental drama; look on the idea of a hero struggling with the divine destiny as pre-eminently Æschylean or Sophoclean; compare the Prologue, with its predominance of narrative, and the presence of the dialogue as only a partial element, with the prologues of Euripides, which also form "epic introductions" to the accompanying dramas; be it that the description of the celestial council in this Prologue anticipates the famous "Prologue in Heaven" of Goethe's Faust;* or be it that in another sense, in that namely which concerns the representation of spiritual conflicts and physical movements as themes of dramatic art, we should be justified in comparing it rather with the Iphigenia and Tasso of our greatest poet, and in saying with Delitzsch that, as in those poems, "the deficiency of external action is compensated by the richness and precision with which the characters are drawn:"—it must not be

* Comp. Ewald, p. 57: "Whether Goethe's Faust is to be compared with this book or not, does not need to be considered here; so much however is clear that without the Book of Job its brilliant opening scene would never have been what it is." See also Baur, *l. c.*, p. 588 seq. [and for a comparison of the two poems, see Merx, xxxiii.-xxxiv. and Froude, *Short Studies*, p. 268 seq.]

forgotten after all that the book is an intellectual creation, the conception and the elaboration of which are thoroughly oriental; that it is the work of one of those profoundly religious sages, endowed with an imagination mighty and lofty in its scope, and with pre-eminent poetic genius, in which the whole East, whether Shemitic or Perso-Indian, so remarkably abounds. If accordingly we are to seek analogies with which to compare the poem as to its idea, character, and plan, we must put in the front Arabic and Hindû poems, such as on the one side the *Consessus* of the celebrated Makama-poet Hariri, already referred to, which at least exhibits a noteworthy parallel to the dialogue form of the middle divisions of our book (comp. Umbreit, p. XXXI.), and on the other side the ancient Hindû narrative of the sufferer Hariçtschandra, sorely tempted and tried by Çiva, which in its oldest and simplest, as yet undramatized form may be found in the Aitareya-Brâhmana, VII. 18, and in the Bhâgavata-Purâna, IX. 7, 6, but which in its complete artistic development in the form of a religious drama is found only in much more recent sources, as *e. g.* in the Markandeya,—and Padma-Purâna (out of Sec. 8-10 of our chronology), as also in modern Hindû popular dramas, which are still regarded with favor.* It is indeed a nearer line of comparison to seek for parallels in the religious and poetic literature of the Old Testament people of God. And here we find on the one side Solomon's *Song of Songs*, which presents itself as a drama, artistically correct, elaborate, and harmoniously complete; on the other side the Solomonic Book of Proverbs, which presents itself as a pearl-like string of numerous ethical and religious apothegms, arranged in part at least in the form of a dramatic dialogue. As to its didactic contents and purpose, our book resembles more the latter of these writings, as to form and composition the former. Nevertheless the profound earnestness of its fundamental thought and of its didactic purpose necessitates important deviations in form and diction from the Song of Solomon, the only representative of a scriptural drama which can be considered along with it. For while the plan of the latter is *melo*-dramatic, and its principal affinities seem to be with the *erotic* lyrics of the classic nationalities, Job, especially in view of the narrative character of the prologue and epilogue, bears the stamp of an *epic* drama, and in its lyric element resembles most closely the *elegiac* poetry of the Greeks. Comp. the General Introduction to the Solomonic Literature of Wisdom, Vol. X. of this series, p. 12.

Furthermore in respect of its external poetic structure, and especially of the *verse and strophe-structure of its discourses*, the book may be most nearly compared with the Proverbs and the Song of Solomon. In these its poetic parts it consists throughout of short verses, mostly of two members; each member contains on an average not more than three to four words. This structure is carried out with the most rigid consistency and great skill through all the discourses, so that in many respects we are reminded of the five-feet iambic lines of the modern drama, and we can understand, or at all events we are inclined to excuse the remark which Jerome once made, although as to the main point it is certainly erroneous, that the book is written in *versus hexametri* (*Præfat. in Job*, T. IX., Opp. p. 1100; comp. my book on Jerome, p. 347).—It cannot escape the sharp observer, moreover, that a greater or less number of single verses everywhere group themselves together in *strophes* or *stanzas*, which coincide with the logical arrangement, or sub-divisions of the thought; and that this strophic division is carried out with tolerable regularity throughout all the discourses. Here and there this strophic structure is indicated even by external signs, *e. g.* in chap. iii., where the second and third strophes alike begin with לָמָה; in ch. xxx., where three strophes, of eight stichs each, are severally introduced by וְעַתָּה; in chap. xxxvi. 22-33, where three

* See in Schlottmann, p. 18 seq. an analysis of the legend of Hariçtschandra, according to these more recent sources, and especially of a drama in the modern Hindû popular dialect, extracts from which have been furnished by Roberts (*Oriental Illustrations*, p. 257 seq.). According to this authority the fundamental idea common to both these productions, the Job-legend and this Hindû poem, seems to be that "the righteous man can obtain the victory with the powers of temptation which advance against him out of the unseen world of spirits." A still more particular point of correspondence lies in the fact that "all the temptations which befall Hariçtschandra aim at extorting from him the *one* falsehood that he had not promised the high reward for the offering presented to the gods by Viçmâmitra (Çiva);"—precisely as in the Book of Job Satan is ever on the watch for the *one* word, by which the sorely tried sufferer is to bid God farewell, and to renounce His service. It is true that our Bible poem represents with incomparably greater depth and purity the inward truth of the sufferer triumphing over these temptations.

series of thoughts in succession begin with הֵן, each forming an eight-line strophe, *etc.* The Masoretes have as in the Psalms and Proverbs used a peculiar *system of accentuation* to indicate both the divisions of stichs and verses, and also this strophe-arrangement throughout the entire poetical sections of the book (*i. e.*, from chap. iii. 2 to chap. xlii. 6). This accentuation, however, which rests on the tradition of the synagogue, important as we must adjudge it to be for the rhythmical adjustment of the composition, and in connection therewith for the exegetical interpretation of these sections, does not nevertheless exclude all doubt in respect to these divisions of thought and of verse in detail. For the authors of the masoretic system of accentuation themselves did not always possess a clear and accurate insight into the strophe-structure, as is shown by the fact that they have almost everywhere erroneously applied their [poetic] accentuation to the prose passages which have occasionally found their way into the poetic sections. The later tradition accordingly has quite generally "the notation-value only of the prose or rhetorical accents, not that of the metrical or poetical." For which reason the more recent commentators differ both in respect to the question whether attempts to restore the strophe-structure are at all permissible, and also in respect to the bounds to be assigned to particular strophes. Stickel and Delitzsch, *e. g.*, assume a constant change of the strophic structure, similar to that which obtains in the lyric poems of the Book of Psalms, and, as a consequence, a somewhat marked inequality in the extent of particular strophes, which are built now of four stichs, now of eight, now of six, or of any greater number of lines. Schlottmann, Köster, Ewald, Vaihinger, and Dillmann, on the contrary maintain that the structure of the strophes is, at least in general, equal and regular, and would determine the law of their construction more in accordance with the Mâshâl-poetry of the Proverbs, than with the lyrical rhythm of the Psalter. In the accompanying translation and explanation of the poem we shall follow in the main the principles which guide the latter class of commentators, for the reason that their greater simplicity seems to us to be pre-eminently in agreement with the character of the poem, which in particular passages indeed is lyrical, but which is predominantly gnomic and didactic (of the Mâshâl genus). Here and there however, and particularly in the discourses of Elihu, the strophic structure of which is in many places wont to be incorrectly rendered, we shall feel constrained to give the preference to the divisions of Stickel and Delitzsch.

[Merx has propounded in his Introduction (p. LXXV. seq.) an ingenious and elaborate theory of the syllabic and strophic structure of Hebrew poetry, which claims for that poetry, especially in its lyric and musical forms, a degree of regularity and symmetry far higher than is usually attributed to it. He finds the true law of its form to be the number of syllables in the stich, or line, the norm being eight syllables to the stich, and the strophes being composed of an equal number of stichs, or of a number symmetrically alternating. Without denying all merit to the theory, or that its author has in not a few instances used it with striking results, it is certain that the sweeping application which he has made of it to the Book of Job, necessitates or invites the most arbitrary treatment of the text, by the assumption of *lacunæ* or interpolations, simply at the demand of the rhetorical structure. Assuredly in Hebrew, as in all Oriental poetry, where "the thought lords it over the form," a far greater degree of liberty and elasticity must be accorded to the form than this theory presupposes.—E.].

Note 1.—In respect to the *artistic beauty and completeness* of the poetic sections, and especially in respect to the skilfulness shown in the *dramatic evolution and delineation of character*, comp. Delitzsch I., p. 16 seq.: "Satan, Job's wife, the hero himself, the three friends,—everywhere diversified and minute description. The poet manifests, also, dramatic skill in other directions. He has laid out the controversial colloquy with a masterly hand, making the heart of the reader gradually averse to the friends, and in the same degree winning it towards Job. He makes the friends all through give utterance to the most glorious truths, which however, in the application to the case before them, turn out to be untrue. And although the whole of the representation serves *one* great idea, it is still not represented by any of the persons brought forward, and is by no one expressly uttered. Every person is, as it were, the consonant letter to the word of this idea; it is throughout the whole book

taken up with the realization of itself; at the end it first comes forth as the resulting product of the whole. Job himself is not less a tragic hero than the Œdipus of the two tragedies of Sophocles. What is there an inevitable fate, expressed by the oracle, is in the book of Job the decree of Jehovah, over whom is no controlling power, decreed in the assembly of angels. As a painful puzzle the lot of affliction comes down on Job. At the beginning he is the victor of an easy battle, until the friends' exhortations to repentance are added to suffering, which in itself is incomprehensible, and make it still harder to be understood. He is thereby involved in a hard conflict, in which at one time, full of arrogant self-confidence, he exalts himself heavenward; at another time sinks to the ground in desponding sadness.

"The God, however, against which he fights, is but a phantom, which the temptation has presented to his beclouded eye, instead of the true God; and this phantom is in no way different from the inexorable fate of the Greek tragedy. As in that the hero seeks to maintain his inward freedom against the secret power which crushes him with an iron arm; so Job maintains his innocence against this God, who has devoted him to destruction as an offender. But in the midst of this terrific conflict with the God of the present, this creation of the temptation, Job's faith gropes after the God of the future, to whom he is ever driven nearer the more mercilessly the enemies pursue him. At length Jehovah really appears, but not at Job's impetuous summons. He appears only after Job has made a beginning of humble self-concession, in order to complete the work begun, by condescendingly going forth to meet him. Jehovah appears, and the Fury vanishes The dualism, which the Greek tragedy leaves unabolished, is here reconciled. Human freedom does not succumb; but it becomes evident that not an absolute arbitrary power, but divine wisdom, whose inmost impulse is love, moulds human destiny."—

Dillmann expresses himself similarly in respect to the surpassing skill shown in the dramatic development, and the fine as well as sharp individualization of character (p. xxi. seq.). He also groups together with these qualities the magnificent power of description, and splendor of diction which characterize this book: "In freshness and power of poetic perception and sensibility, in wealth and splendor of imagery, in inexhaustible fulness of ideas, in fineness of psychological insight and observation of nature, in the faculty of picturing the most manifold movements of the world of nature and of humanity, in the ability to reproduce the same thing appareled in a form that is ever new, in the art of modulating the tone and complexion of the speakers, according to their various moods, of adapting himself equally to sorrow and lamentation, to anger and passion, to scorn and bitterness, to yearning and hope, to rest and contentment, in the art of setting forth with peculiar impressiveness the majesty, dignity, power, and clearness of God, when He speaks, and finally in mastery of language, in beauty, weight, and terseness of expression, this poet may be put on an equality with the best models of all ages. His work is artistically wrought down to its every detail. Each of the four discourses of the book is a masterpiece of itself, and full of fine relations to the rest," *etc.*—Comp. also Ewald, p. 54 seq.; Vaihinger, p. 15 seq.; Schlottmann, p. 40 seq.; 44 seq.; 54 seq.; 66 seq. [A B Davidson, xxiii. seq.; Merx, xvii. seq., xlvii. seq.; Lowth, Lecture xxxiv.; Renan, *Etude, etc.*, p. lxi. seq.; Princeton Rev., Vol. xxix. p. 325].

Note 2.—Special consideration should be given to the peculiar beauty and loftiness of the poetic art of the book, as these qualities are seen in *its descriptions of nature, its physical images and similes,* and as they impart to it a mode of perception, thought, and composition characterized by a peculiar primitive power and freshness, an antique, as it were *patriarchal* simplicity, depth, and pungent power. The Catholic theologian Gügler, a thoughtful pupil of Herder's remarks on this peculiarity: "Nature stands everywhere before the soul in its primeval form, touching as it were on chaos. The mountain ranges, the roaring waters, the outstretched heaven, the sun, the constellations,—these are the wonders, surpassing number, which take the feeling by storm. The unveiled abysses, the outspread night, the earth hanging on nothing, the water gathered up in the clouds, the quaking pillars of heaven, the thunder, the lightning shining to the ends of the world,—these are the phenomena, not to be numbered, these are the wonders not to be searched out, which occupy the aroused faculty of thought. Nature in its primitive vastness and depth lies before the wondering struggling

heart" (Gügler, *Die heil Kunst*, III., p. 144).—Comp. Herder (*Briefe* I., 11): "The outlook which this book furnishes presents itself to me now as the starry heaven, now as the joyous wild tumult of creation, now as humanity's profoundest wail, from the ash-heap of a prince, among the rocks of the Arabian desert." Also Joh. Friedr. v. Meyer, who remarks of the book: "Its massive style, its lights and shadows, the enigmatic obscurity of its terse expressions, that largeness of spirit with which it moves forward, compassing worlds and weighing an atom, looking through men, and penetrating the wondrous depths of the Godhead,—this lofty character has at all times made the book an object of deserved reverence."—Of the latest critics and expositors G. Baur has in particular deemed this peculiarity of thought and representation in the book worthy of attentive consideration in the treatise already cited—*Das Buch Hiob und Dante's Göttl. Komödie.* "It would scarcely be an exaggeration," he says (p. 621 seq.) "to affirm that there are in Job as many representations of nature as in all the rest of the Old Testament; from heaven to hell the poet traverses the whole realm of creation. Especially does his gaze delight to rest on the phenomena of heaven; and it is a characteristic fact that in his poem, moving as it does in the sphere of pastoral life, and in the prophecies of the herdsman Amos, may be found the entire Old Testament nomenclature of the stars. . . . From heaven he turns to the water which is bound up together in the clouds (chap. xxvi. 8 seq.), to the hail and snow, which are there prepared (chap. xxviii. 22 seq.), to the lightning and thunder (chap. xxxviii. 25, 35), and with especial frequency does he speak of the rain-showers, which in that climate are doubly precious and beneficent (chap. v. 10; xxxviii. 25, 28, 37 seq.). This brings him to the earth, which hangs upon nothing (chap. xxvi. 7); he thinks of the sea, which is shut in with doors (chap. xxxviii. 8); he remembers with peculiar interest the brook which dries up, and mournfully deceives the hope of the caravans (chap. vi. 15; xiv. 11); and he goes down to the gates of death (chap. xxxviii. 17). . . . The whole splendor of these descriptions is concentrated in chap. xxxviii.—xli. In a series of incomparably vivid delineations, by means of a few firm master-strokes, there are produced before us, with all their various peculiarities, the lion, the raven, the gazelle, the wild ass freely roaming, the swift ostrich, the spirited horse, the hawk and eagle, the hippopotamus and crocodile. Even the fabulous phenix is not forgotten (chap. xxix. 18)."—Baur then justly gives prominence to the fact that even a Humboldt has paid his tribute of admiration to our poet's deep inward sensibility to nature and his talent for description [*Cosmos* II., pp. 414, 415, Bohn's Scient. Lib.].

§ 4. IDEA AND AIM OF THE BOOK.

In so far as the Book of Job seeks to harmonize the fact that men endure unmerited suffering, or at least suffering which is not directly merited, with the divine justice, it labors at the solution of a problem which falls in the category of the *theodicies, i. e.* the attempt to justify the presence of sin in a world created by God It exhibits "the struggle and victory of the new truth, that sufferings are not merely penalties, that they have other causes founded in the divine wisdom; that they may be, to wit, trials and tests, out of which piety should come forth strengthened and purified. It sets forth the doctrine that man, when dark sufferings burst upon him, for which he can find no reason in the sins which he has committed, must not doubt the righteousness and love of God, which are eternally unchanged, but must rather in humility recognize the imperfection of his own righteousness, which needed such a trial, in order to verify itself and attain to faith" (Hahn). The idea of the poem consists accordingly in the proposition that God in His wisdom decrees for His human children calamities and grievous providences, which are *not* directly and unqualifiedly *the penalties of sin*, but in part *chastisements for purification*, and in part *means for proving and testing the sufferers*, serving to illustrate and demonstrate their righteousness.

This proposition finds expression in the epico-dramatic development of the history *in four stages.*

1. The one-sided opinion, derived from a perverted interpretation and application of the Mosaic Law, but predominantly prevalent among the large mass of those who belonged

to the Old Covenant, that grievous sufferings are always and without fail a punishment for specific sins, and even that the magnitude of the sufferer's guilt can be inferred from the magnitude of his calamity;—this opinion being advocated by *the three friends of Job*, who through their advocacy of it become his opponents, and intensify most bitterly his painful consciousness of unmerited suffering.

2. The simple denial of this proposition, involving the affirmation that even an innocent man may suffer, and that he [Job] in particular is an innocent sufferer, who will yet be surely proved to be such by Jehovah, is defended by *Job* in his replies to the accusations of the friends.

3. The *first half* of the correct positive solution of the problem, consisting in the presentation of the chastening and purifying aim of unmerited suffering, is contributed by *the discourses of Elihu*. They seek in a way which accords with Prov. iii. 11 (comp. Heb. xii. 5 seq.) to exhibit the sufferings of the righteous man as chastisements and means of purification, having "the sin of the righteous man indeed for their ground, but having for their motive not God's wrath, but His love, aiming to refine and to advance the sufferer."

4. The *other half* of the positive solution of the problem, consisting in the exhibition of the suffering of the righteous as ordained to prove them and to test their innocence, finds expression in *the discourses of Jehovah*, in His judicial arbitration between the contending parties, as well as in His actual restoration of Job's former prosperity. According to this, the profoundest solution, in which the whole scope of the book culminates, and finds its definitive authoritative expression, the afflictions of the innocent are "means of proving and testing, which, like chastisements, find their motive in the love of God. Their object is not, however, the purging away of the sin which may still cling to the righteous man, but, on the contrary, the manifestation and testing of his righteousness" (Delitzsch).

The former side of the positive solution, that advanced by Elihu, belongs as yet to the circle of human perceptions and experiences; it represents the highest and the deepest that the wisdom of man on earth, limited to itself, except indeed as it derives aid from the Old Testament revelation of God, can contribute to the answer to be made to the inquiry into the nature and aim [of such sufferings]. The latter side of the solution which finds its expression in the discourses of Jehovah, and the historical movement of the entire book, proceeds from a wisdom which is from above, and to which the corruption of the human race is not the first thing and the last, but something transitory, a condition destined to be finally removed through the suffering of a perfectly and absolutely Righteous Man. The solution of Elihu looks backward to the original sin of humanity, and to the mournful fact of experience proceeding therefrom, that not one of the children of men is righteous before God, but that on the contrary there adheres even to the most innocent and pure member of our race sin, which will need to be purged away. The divine solution—which, as will be more fully shown hereafter, by no means contradicts that of Elihu, but in part confirms, and in part supplements it—looks prophetically forward to the future expiatory suffering of a Righteous Man, who alone deserves to be called truly righteous, whose martyrdom accordingly bears the character of a suffering not for Himself alone, but for His brethren, laden with guilt, and needing to be reconciled with God, who in short as a truly innocent sufferer, is called to be the redeemer of the human race, making atonement for their sins, removing their guilt, and procuring their sanctification. To the extent that the indirectly Messianic element of this divine solution comes in close contact with the deepest and noblest side of that which Job maintains, with the expression of his hope that God will appear to vindicate and establish conspicuously his innocence—or, in other words, to the extent that what Job says in the *second*, as yet subjective and one-sidedly negative stage in the solution of the problem, of his confident waiting for a divine redeemer (a גּוֹאֵל, ch. xix. 25), receives both directly and indirectly an objective confirmation and attestation from Jehovah Himself in the *fourth* stage of the solution—we may assign the whole poem to the class of Old Testament writings which are mediately and implicitly Messianic. At least we may say that its idea, like that of the other Chokmah-poems (Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes), includes in itself and suggests a prophetic Messianic thought.

We find these fundamental ideas of the book correctly perceived and set forth with satisfactory clearness only on the part of such expositors as maintain its integrity, especially of such as do not doubt the genuineness of the discourses of Elihu. Here belong especially Vaihinger, Stickel, Gleiss (*Beiträge zur Kritik des Buches Hiob*, 1845, p. 34 seq.), Hävernick, Keil (*Hist. krit. Einleitung*, III., p. 300 seq.), Welte, Delitzsch, Davidson (Introd., p. 213 seq.).* Several, however, even of the opponents of the genuineness of the sections ch. xxxii.–xxxvii. have with approximate correctness defined the idea and the problem of the book, as *e. g.* Heiligstedt, Dillmann, and again recently Schrader in his *Bearbeitung der de Wette'schen Einleitung*, p. 551 seq.—On the contrary the fundamental thought of the book has been subjected, by the advocates of the book's integrity no less than by its opponents, to expositions which are wrong and one-sided, and in some instances even fundamentally perverse. The greater or less value of these theories will be ascertained by the measure of their agreement with that which is given above.

a. According to Umbreit, Hirzel, Renan [Noyes], and some others, the poet aims *to prove the untenableness of the Mosaic doctrine of retribution*, the weak points of which he was desirous of exhibiting in the suffering of the righteous Job, as a peculiarly striking example. Against which it has been rightly argued by Hahn, Dillmann, Delitzsch, *etc.:* That the polemic edge of the book is turned not against the Mosaic doctrine of retribution in itself considered, but against the abuse of it to an unfriendly caviling, malicious suspicion, and harsh judgment concerning persons in misfortune. That it proceeds in truth upon a deeper apprehension and a more correct interpretation of the doctrine of retribution set forth in the Law, not in opposition to it (which would be in fact equivalent to opposing the law itself), is particularly shown by the close of the book, where on the one side Job is compelled to retract the doubt which he had previously uttered in respect to God's righteousness, while on the other side by this same divine righteousness, which now appears as retributive justice in the good sense of the term, as rewarding him (*justitia remunerans s. retribuens*), he is again restored to honor, and his innocence is brought forth to the light.

b. According to a remark thrown out without reflection by Heinr. Heine (*Vermischte Schriften*, 1854, I.), the poet is treating of the development of religious doubt. "The Book of Job is *the Canticle of Skepticism* [*das Hohelied der Skepsis*], and horrid serpents hiss therein their eternal Wherefore? As man when he suffers must weep himself out, so must Job doubt himself out. This poison of doubt must not be wanting in the Bible, that great storehouse of mankind."—A crude opinion, proceeding from a monstrous exaggeration of the foregoing one-sided theory, and directly at variance with the true scope of the book, which is on the contrary anti-skeptical, and which strengthens the belief in God's providence and righteous retribution. Delitzsch remarks truly that the name—"Canticle of Skepticism" —would better suit the Book of Ecclesiastes.

c. According to Baumgarten-Crusius (*Libri de Jobo argumenti descriptio, in Opusc. theologica*, 1836, p. 174 seq.) the book aims "to unfold the idea of the true Wisdom."—Evidently a definition of its contents and aim which is far too general, vague and abstract, and which improperly loses sight of the special object, in accordance with which the poet exhibits and illustrates true wisdom (*sensu subjectivo et objectivo*).

d. According to Schärer (*D. B. Hiob*, 1818, I., p. 21), and Augusti (*Grundriss einer histor. krit. Einl. ins Alte Testament*, 1827, p. 267) [Lee, *Introd. to Commy.*, p. 111], it is the poet's purpose to present in Job *the ideal of a constant, pious and submissive sufferer.* A similar view is taken by Hengstenberg (in his Dissertation "über d. B. Hiob," Berlin, 1856 [also in *D. B. Hiob erläutert*, Berlin, 1870, p. 11 seq.]), who finds represented in the book *the model of a suffering righteous man*, such as was possible in the theocracy of the Old Covenant, but which could never have existed within the pre-Christian heathen world.—But it is only in the Prologue that Job is spoken of as a character that through all his misery was unchangeably pious and devout. His conduct as it appears further along in the course of his discourses receives at last a severe rebuke from God Himself. And in fact, according to

* [It is, however, a curious error on the part of our author to assign the last two writers to this class, seeing that Delitzsch seriously questions, and Davidson decidedly rejects, the genuineness of Elihu's discourses.]

the poet's plan, it is not as an ideal of theocratic piety that Job appears, but as a holy man, whose religious development takes place on the basis of the patriarchal life outside of Israel. This is seen plainly enough in the fact that the scene of the history is placed in the land of Uz, in the fact that the Divine names almost exclusively used by Job are Eloah and Shaddai ("Jehovah" being used twice only), also in the many other traces and indications which the book furnishes of a saint of the order of Melchizedek. Comp. below, § 7 [and see Conant's criticism of this view, p. xx. seq.].

e. According to Schlottmann and Keil (*Einleitung*) [Good, *Introductory Dissertation*, p. 12. 19; A. B. Davidson, p. 15, *etc.*, Canon Cook in Smith's *Bib. Dict.* Art. "Job," and in *Bible Commentary*, Introd., p. 6; Froude, *Short Studies, etc.:* "The Book of Job," p. 241 seq.], the author aims to describe by *a picture from life* the struggle and victory of the pious man in the most terrible temptation. Against which Dillmann rightly says: "If it was not also his purpose to advance the knowledge of his readers, and to instruct them in respect to the relation of evil [suffering] to the moral conduct of men, it is inconceivable why he should have made his work to consist for the most part of a series of controversial discourses respecting the ground and end of suffering."

f. According to Stuhlmann, Bertholdt, Eichhorn, v. Cölln (*Bibl. Theol.*, p. 293 seq.), M. Sachs (*Zur Charakteristik und Erläuterung d. B. Hiob*, *Studd. u. Krit.*, 1834, IV., p. 912) Knobel (*De carminis Jobi argumento, fine, ac dispositione,* 1835) Vatke (*Die Rel. des Alten Testaments*, I., 1835, p. 576 seq.), Umbreit, De Wette, Hirzel, Steudel (*Vorlesungen über die Theol. des Alten Testaments, herausg. v. Oehler*, 1840, p. 511 seq.), Hupfeld (*Deutsche Zeitschr. f. christl. Wissensch., etc.*, 1850, No. 35 seq.) [Merx, p. XIII.; Rodwell, p. VIII.], the poet has indeed a didactic purpose; it is one however which is limited to the inculcation of the doctrine of the unconditional submission of the finite subject to the absolute Lord of all things, whose dispensations, even when they seem incomprehensible, are still to be borne with resignation, and without murmuring.—According to this view the book represents Job's suffering as an absolutely mysterious dispensation, and thus preaches a certain fatalism, the resignation of a stoic indifference to the inexorable and inscrutable will of destiny. This is wholly antagonistic both to the spirit of the Old Testament in general, and of our book in particular, which furnishes clear expositions respecting the ground and end of Job's sufferings, and that not simply in those sections which the above-named critics (for the most part at least) condemn as not genuine, in the prologue, the epilogue, and the discourses of Elihu, but also in the kernel of the book, the authenticity of which cannot be questioned, as *e. g.* in Job's utterances in ch. xvii. 9; xix. 23 seq.; xxxi. 1 seq.

g. According to J. D. Michaelis (*Einl. in die göttl. Schriften des A. Bdes.* I., 2 seq.) the poet aims to set forth the idea of a righteous retribution in the future life. The view of Ewald is similar, according to whom the book develops the thought: that suffering is to be overcome neither by conceiving it as merely a divine penalty, nor by doubt and unbelief, but only by *the certainty that spirit is eternal*, by patience and fortitude through faith in eternal divine truths, and also by self-knowledge sharpened anew by suffering (*Die Dichter des A. B.* III., p. 10 seq.)—According to this view the idea of immortality and future retribution, which emerges in the book only incidentally, is unduly emphasized and made prominent. Moreover, according to Ewald's view, earthly suffering is removed much too far from its connection with the sin of the human race. The man afflicted with it, in the proud consciousness of his own strength and immortality, like the suffering heroes of the classic poetry of antiquity (Ulysses, Philoctetes) should have lifted himself above his sufferings and despised them, instead of doing what our poet manifestly requires him to do, humbling himself as a sinner under the almighty hand of the God decreeing them (ch. xl 3; xlii. 1-6).*

h. According to several Rabbis of the Middle Ages, and also H. v. d. Hardt (*Commentat. in Jobum, sive historia populi Israelis in Assyriaco exilio*, I., 1728), J. LeClerc (on chap. i. 1), Garnett (*A dissertation on the book of Job*, ed. 2, 1751), Warburton (*The Divine Legation of Moses*, Book VI., Sect. II., Works, Vol. V., London, 1811), Bernstein (*Ueber Alter, Inhalt,*

* [See Conant's refutation of this theory, Introd., p. xiv.].

Zweck, und gegenwärtige Gestalt des Buches Hiob, in Keil & Tzschirner, *Analekten*, I., 1813, p. 109 seq), Bruno Bauer (*Die Religion des A. T.*, 1840, II., p. 470 seq.), and quite recently F. Seinecke (*Der Grundgedanke des B. Hiob*, 1863), [G. Croly: The Book of Job, 1863], the idea and scope of the book have reference to the *Israelitish nationality*. The suffering Job typifies the sufferings of the people of Israel in exile; by his patience and submission the poet would teach his contemporaries that they can bear their severe destiny only by humble submission to God's power and wisdom, and that they can find comfort and rest only in a firm and childlike trust in His righteousness, which ruleth over all things.—This allegoristic version of the poem is disproved by the absence of anything whatever in the details of the work to sustain such a double significance in the person and destinies of Job; also by the want of proof that the poem was not composed until after the exile; finally by the fact that in the prologue Job is described as entirely innocent in his misfortune, whereas elsewhere throughout the Old Testament the exile is continually viewed as the well-deserved punishment of Israel's sins. Comp. the elaborate criticism of the last-mentioned work of Seinecke's in the *Darmstädter Theolog. Litbl.*, 1863, No. 99.

i. According to most expositors of the ancient and mediæval Church, whom some moderns have also followed, particularly in the Romish Church, Job's suffering is an immediate *type of the atoning suffering of Christ;* nay more, Job himself is more or less identified with Christ, the views and principles advocated by him merge imperceptibly in the doctrines of the Gospel; whereas on the contrary the three friends are regarded as the champions of heretical opinions, and Elihu as the representative of a secular wisdom hostile to faith (Jerome, *etc.*), or as an idle philosophical braggart, and phrase-monger (Gregory the Great, *etc.*). [Wordsworth, however, who also adheres to the typical interpretation of the book, regards Elihu as "representing the office of the ministers of God's Church in preparing the soul for the presence of God by the preaching of His Word." Introd. to Comm'y., p. ix. See also Comm'y., p. 70 seq.]. We may find one effect of this unsound allegoristic interpretation of the history under ecclesiastical auspices—an interpretation which may be traced back to Origen, the founder of all unsound allegoristic theories in the Church—in the unfavorable judgment which has been pronounced on the religious and moral stand-point and character of Elihu by many of the latest expositors, *e. g.*, by Herder, who compares his discourses to the idle senseless chatter of a child, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Umbreit, Hahn, and others, who make him out to be an immoderate, self-sufficient, and at the same time narrow-minded boaster. The erroneousness of these views will sufficiently appear from the remarks made above. Comp. also what is said below, in § 8, concerning the genuineness of Elihu's discourses, and their admirable coherence with the entire plan and movement of the book; together with the Exegetical remarks on the same (particularly the Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks on chap. xxxii., xxxiii.).

§ 5. THE RELIGIOUS AND NATIONAL CHARACTER OF THE BOOK. ITS PLACE IN THE CANON.

The Chokmah character of our book, or the fact that it belongs to the Solomonic poems of Wisdom, is sufficiently apparent from that which has been already remarked about its material, its form, and its scope. The historic *material* used bears an impress which, if not extra-theocratic, is at least pre-theocratic; and manifest pains are taken to give prominence to this characteristic of its material, as being *not* specifically Mosaic, by distinctly setting forth the extra Israelitish home, and the patriarchal age of its hero. Its object is thereby recognized as belonging to that class of themes and problems which are of universal human interest, which transcend the more limited circle of vision which lies within the Israelitish theocracy, and which everywhere characterize the Chokmah-poetry, the representative in the Old Testament literature of a philosophic humanism (comp. Vol. X. of this series, Introd. to Proverbs, p. 4 seq.).—As regards its *form* it seems to be most nearly related to the classic productions of the Chokmah-literature; to Solomon's Song in virtue of its dramatic plan and arrangement; to the Proverbs in virtue of its gnomic and didadic character, and the

Mâshâl-like rhythm of its discourses; and to both at once in virtue of its wealth of vivid and symbolically significant pictures of the life of nature and humanity, in which the deep feeling for nature, and the faculty of brilliant natural description characteristic of the Solomonic epoch of Old Testament literature announce themselves.—And finally in respect of its scope it exhibits a relation of inward nearness to the poetry of Wisdom, in so far as by virtue of its endeavor to maintain in the realm of ethics and religion the point of view belonging to universal humanity this poetry has a special interest in the great problem of theodicy, to wit, the vindication of the Divine action against one-sided and unjust accusations from men; and especially in so far as the indispensable necessity of the fear of God and of humble submission beneath God's remedial discipline (מוּסָר) to the right understanding of God's dispensations is an idea which belongs to the very heart of the practical ethics of those books, and particularly of the Book of Proverbs. And not only does our book share this ethical tendency in common with the other Chokmah-writings, but in addition the most conspicuous feature of their doctrinal contents, to wit, the central idea of *the Divine Wisdom* as the medium of the personal activity of God in the world of nature and of humanity, is by no means absent. But on the contrary the way in which our poet in ch. xxviii. 1 seq. describes the absolute wisdom, the Chokmah pure and simple, as the highest moral good, and as the sum total of all that is valuable and desirable for man, at the same time that he makes its possession depend on the fear of God and uprightness of life (ver. 28), exhibits the closest affinity with that which is said in Prov. iii. 16 seq.; viii. 22 seq. (comp. Eccles. xii. 13) of the hypostatic wisdom of God, and the conditions of participation in the same. All the characters, moreover, who take part as speakers in the book, appear as witnesses and disciples of this wisdom, whether as one-sided, defective, erroneous representatives, as was the case with the three friends, and in many respects with Job himself, or as normal and authoritative interpreters of the true Wisdom, as was the case with Elihu, who, notwithstanding his youth, surpasses all the other speakers as the representative of the highest to which human wisdom and insight can attain. They are, one and all, Châkâmîm, lovers of wisdom and teachers of wisdom (*sectatores sapientiæ, φιλόσοφοι*)—these characters of the great drama—although there are important differences among them as regards the quality and degree of the wisdom which they teach. The author certainly does not describe them as theocratic sages, not as belonging to the class of Israelitish Châkâmîm, like Solomon, Ethan, Heman, *etc.*, for he causes their extra-Israelitish character to appear distinctly and unmistakably enough, when he introduces them as speaking neither of the law, nor of prophecy, neither of Sinai, nor of Zion, as using only once or twice the theocratic name of God, Jehovah (Job uses this name only in ch. i. 21; xii. 9; and possibly in ch. xxviii. 28, see on the passage), but on the contrary as using interchangeably the אֱלוֹהַּ of poetry, the שַׁדַּי of the patriarchs, and the אֱלֹהִים of the universal religion (the last, however, only three times: ch. xx. 29; xxxii. 2; xxxviii. 7). He thus purposely characterizes them as belonging to the category of those extra-Israelitish sages, which in 1 Kings v. 10, *apropos* of the description of the all-surpassing wisdom of Solomon, are called "sons of the East," and "Egyptians" (comp. Job i. 2); it is his purpose to describe them, and among them Job in particular, as well as Elihu, as possessors of a wisdom and a piety which had not grown in the soil of the Mosaic Law, which were pre-Mosaic and patriarchal, or, if you please, Melchizedekean (comp. the *Note* at the end of this section). Notwithstanding all this, however, they are none the less disciples of Wisdom, earthly reflectors, human reverers, and lovers of the divine Chokmah. The heavenly light of God, which from the beginning lighteth every man that cometh into the world (John i. 9), this is their sun also, the mysterious source of their knowledge and understanding. They belong to the children of God outside of Israel, the "children of God that were scattered abroad" (John xi. 52), whom the Saviour of the world was first to gather together, and to introduce into the communion of the redeemed. They partake, however, of the knowledge and worship of the supreme, the only true God. And verily it is a divine wisdom which is specially and most nearly related to that of the Israelitish theocracy, a wisdom originating in Paradise, and like that of Solomon, Ethan, Heman, *etc.*, struggling back toward Paradise, which illuminates them. It is its advance through error, doubt and serious conflicts to the

final comprehension of revealed truth, that our poem succeeds in describing with the wonderful art of dramatic development.

After all that has been said, our book's *place in the canon* of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament can admit of no doubt. It stands in the closest proximity to the Chokmah-poems of the Solomonic age, the Book of Proverbs, and the Canticles. At all events it stands nearer to them than to Ecclesiastes, with which, in view of the many traces it betrays of a later (post-exilic) origin, and in view of its Levitico-Jewish character, it has nothing in common, however true it may be that the sceptical tinge of many of its discourses indicates a certain affinity to certain fundamental ideas of this later poem of wisdom. Its Mâshâl-form, and the frequent lyrico-elegiac tone of its discourses, assimilate it still further to those portions of the Book of Psalms, which in view of the gnomic and didactic stamp which they bear are to be classed with the Literature of Wisdom, and which we have heretofore (Vol. X. of this Series, Introd.) characterized as Chokmah-psalms; as, *e. g.*, Ps. i., xv., xix., cxi., cxii., cxix., cxxv., cxxvii.

In fact both the Synagogue and the Church have constantly assigned to our book its place not only in general among the Hagiographa (K'thubhîm), to which it belongs in any case in virtue of its being neither a historical narrative, nor prophetic preaching, but rather a didactic poem, but also in particular in proximity to the books just mentioned as most nearly related to it, the Psalms, the Proverbs, the Canticles, and Ecclesiastes. But its place in the neighborhood of these books varies greatly according to the different traditions. Our editions of the Hebrew Bible, in so far as they follow the German class of Manuscripts, place the book between the Proverbs and the Canticles; they place it last of the series of poetic books which introduce the Hagiographa, the Tehillîm, Mishlê, and Job (Psalms, Proverbs, and Job), leaving the Song of Solomon to follow as the first of the "five festival-rolls" (חמש מגלות), that group of writings the remainder of which are Ruth, Lamentations, Koheleth, and Esther. According to the Spanish class of Hebrew MSS., and the Masora, the arrangement is different, the K'thubhîm here beginning with the series—Chronicles, Psalms, Job, and Proverbs. The arrangement in the Talmud (Baba bathra, 14 *b*) is similar, where Ruth is put first, with Psalms, Job, and Proverbs following. The Masoretes call this group (Tehillîm, Job, Mishlê), after the initial letters of their names, ספרי תאם, and they view this Team—group as being, like the Chamesh Megilloth, a complete whole. Whether the *vox memorialis* אמת, which serves to describe the group according to another ancient tradition, indicates that here and there the order—Job, Proverbs, Psalms—was actually followed, is doubtful. It is certain on the other hand that the LXX. assign to the three principal poetical books the order—Job, Psalms, Proverbs (the form אתם), and that this order of the Alexandrian canon has continued to be the ruling order in the Hellenistic literature and in the Church. There are variations however even here, as in Philo, and the Evangelist Luke, who, like the Hebrew Bibles, place the Psalms (ὕμνους) at the head (Luke xxiv. 44), and in Melito of Sardis, in the 2d Cent., whose canon exhibits the following peculiar order for the poetical Hagiographa:—Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Job, (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* IV., 26). Luther's version [also E. V.] follows the order which through the Alexandrian version is become the established order in the Church.

Note.—In respect to the skill and historical truth with which the poet has succeeded in preserving the impress of patriarchal times, and the pre-Mosaic, and hence extra-Israelitish religious individuality of his characters, comp. Dillmann, p. XXII.: "He has carefully avoided any intermixture of Israelitish things, manners, and ideas; he has throughout exhibited the ways and the relations of the four men in accordance with the patriarchal age, relying in part on Genesis. When they appeal to historical illustrations, they are taken from primeval history (as in chap. xxii. 15 seq.). What they say of God, and of divine things, is apparently derived only from the good old tradition, from nature, and the history of universal humanity. Except in three passages they do not even use the divine name, Jahve. Their circle of thought and expression is far more distinctively that of the Shemitic people in general than that of the Canaanitish Hebrews. The theatre of the poem is the edge of the desert (see *e. g.*, chap. i. 15, 17, 19), and its figures and illustrations correspond

therewith (as in chap. vi. 18 seq.; xi. 12; xxiv. 5; xxxi. 32)."—The views of Delitzsch are similar, who takes occasion however to controvert the modern opinion that the poet in the exercise of a free creative fancy invented all these characteristics of an extra-Israelitish nationality and religion on the part of his hero, and justly maintains in opposition the opinion which in substance has been advocated also by Hengstenberg (*Beiträge*, II., 302 seq.: *Vortrag über das Buch Hiob*, 1856). "The book of Job," says Delitzsch (I., p. 6 seq.) "treats a fundamental question of our common humanity; and the poet has studiously taken his hero not from Israelitish history, but from extra-Israelitish tradition. From beginning to end he is conscious of relating an extra-Israelitish history,—a history handed down among the Arab tribes to the east of Palestine, which has come to his ears; for none of the proper names contain even a trace of symbolically intended meaning, and romantic historical poems were nowhere in use among the ancients. *This extra-Israelitish history from the patriarchal period excited the purpose of his poem, because the thought therein presented lay in his own mind.* The Thora from Sinai, and prophecy, the history and worship of Israel are nowhere introduced; even indirect references to them nowhere escape him. He throws himself with wonderful truthfulness, consistency, and vividness, into the extra-Israelitish position. His own Israelitish stand-point he certainly does not disavow, as we see from his calling God יהוה everywhere in the prologue and epilogue; but the non-Israelitish character of his hero and of his locality he maintains with strict consistency. . . . Even many of the designations of the divine attributes which have become fixed in the Thora, as רַחוּם, חַנּוּן, אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם, which one might well expect in the book of Job, are not found in it; nor again טוֹב, often used of Jehovah in the Psalms; nor, generally, the dogmatic terminology, as it may be called, of the Israelitish religion; besides which this characteristic is to be noted, that only the oldest mode of heathen worship, star-worship (chap. xxxi. 26–28), is mentioned, without even the name of God (יה׳ה צבאות or אלהים צבאות) occurring, which designates God as Lord of the heavens, which the heathen deified. The author has intentionally avoided this name also, which is the star of the time of the Israelitish kings; for he is never unmindful that his subject is an ante- and extra-Israelitish one."—In these last remarks of Delitzsch's, with which we are constrained to agree, may be found the corrective for a remark of Dillmann's which is one-sided, and not altogether free from the liability to be misunderstood. When this commentator, who is generally influenced by sound and correct views says (p. XVII. of the Introd. to his Comm'y.): "So far is it from being the author's purpose to transport himself arbitrarily out of the circle of revealed truth, that, on the contrary, his whole problem alike with his solution of it, rests on the Mosaic system of doctrine"—it would seem to be his purpose to assign everything, both the doctrinal contents of the poem and the history which serves as its framework, to the circle of the Mosaic system, while nevertheless the personal actors, as well as the religious ideas and representations which are put in their mouth, are intentionally described as pre-Mosaic, and presented from an extra-theocratic point of view. Very true the poet himself, where his historic individuality emerges, as in the prologue and epilogue, reveals himself as an Israelite, a worshipper of Jehovah, an adherent of Mosaism. But his heroes, or the characters of his drama, bear a pre Mosaic patriarchal impress; they are sages of the class called "sons of the East," 1 Kings v. 10, [E. V., iv. 30] not sages versed in the Law, and ministering to the Law, like Solomon, Ethan, Heman, Chalcol, Darda, or like the prophets of the schools of Samuel and Elijah. And the religious-ethical problem discussed by them is one which did not grow in the soil of the Mosaic religion, but an outgrowth of the piety and practical wisdom of the old Shemitic patriarchs, however true it may be that the profound solution which it receives in course of their discussion presupposes something above and beyond the perceptions and experiences which belong to the patriarchal stage of revelation, admitting indeed that in this same solution there is contained a supra-patriarchal and supra-Mosaic element, a prophetic anticipation of the future transition of these two preparatory stages of the true religion into the stage of their absolute fulfilment and perfection through Christ. Comp. Delitzsch (I, p. 8 seq.): "The poet is thoroughly imbued with the conviction that even beyond Israel fellowship is possible with the one living God, who has revealed Himself in Israel; that He also there

continually reveals Himself, ordinarily in the conscience, and extraordinarily in dreams and visions; that there is also found there a longing and struggling after that redemption of which Israel has the clear words of promise. His wondrous book soars high above the Old Testament limit; it is the Melchizedek among the Old Testament books. The final and highest solution of the problem with which it grapples, has a vein extending out even beyond the patriarchal history. The Wisdom of the Book of Job originates from Paradise. For this turning to the primeval histories of Genesis, which are earlier than the rise of the nations, and the investigation of the hieroglyphs in the prelude to the Thora, which are otherwise almost passed over in the Old Testament, belong to the peculiarities of the Chokma."

§ 6. THE TIME WHEN THE BOOK WAS WRITTEN.

As an *external* indication of value in determining the time when the book of Job was written, we may take into account its position in the canon, near the Psalms and the book of Proverbs, always before the book of Ecclesiastes, which shows so many traces of a later age. This position, however, is too uncertain; and even if it were fixed, it could still not be inferred from it that the book, although placed near those writings of the age of David and Solomon, had also been produced about that time, a considerable period, that is to say, before the book of Coheleth, which was not written until after the Exile. And in general the rule followed by those who collected and arranged the canon is not that of strict chronology, and yields only very general and indefinite conclusions in respect to the successive origination of particular books.

Of greater value would another external criterion be, that, namely, which lies in the *linguistic* vesture of the book, provided only that the fact that, comparatively, it abounds in Aramäisms could be made to prove that it was written in a decidedly late age. But there is not, and there never can be, a history of the development of the Hebrew language so strict in its chronology that each of its stages can be sharply defined, and used as means for determining the time of particular books, or sections of books.* The Aramaic coloring, together with the correspondences with the later Hebrew, of which the book furnishes many instances (such as *e. g.* plural forms in ִין, the use of the preposition לְ for the accusative, words like קִבֵּל לָהֶן [found once even in the prose prologue, ch. ii. 10], גְּזַר, תְּקַף, סֵדֶר, עַשְׁתּוּת, תַּכְלִית, or even Aramaizing forms such as occur in ch. vi. 27; viii. 8; xv. 7; xxi. 23, *etc.*), prove nothing definite in favor of a later origin, for such peculiarities are of general occurrence in books of a highly poetic character, as *e. g.* in Solomon's Song, in the Song of Deborah, Judges v.; and also in the prophet Amos, although these books must not for that reason be brought down very late in time. Moreover, Bernstein (in *Keil und Tzschirner's Analekten*, I. 3), and others have advanced statements which are decidedly exaggerated in respect to the number of the Aramaisms in our book; statements which are equally worthless with the opinion, which has been expressed here and there from an early time, that the book in its present form has for its basis an Aramaic text—an opinion which the apocryphal appendix to the LXX., following ch. xlii. 17, has already expressed: *οὗτος ἑρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλος*, and which has been still further advocated by Aben-Ezra, Jurieu, Carpzovius, the last two in connection with the endeavor to discover the author of the translation into Hebrew, whom they identify either with Moses (so Carpz.), or with Solomon (so Jurieu: comp. also the following section at the beginning).—If the linguistic character of the book be examined for more definite data in support of conjectures respecting the time when it was written, the correspondences with the vocabulary and usage of the book of Proverbs might first of all be considered; as *e. g.* ch. xx. 18 (עלס) with Prov. vii. 18; ch. v. 2 (פתה) with Prov. xx. 19; ch. xii. 5; xxx. 24; xxxi. 29 (פִּיד) with Prov. xxiv. 22; ch. xxxiii. 7 (אכף) with Prov. xvi. 26; ch. xxxvii. 12 (תַּחְבֻּלוֹת) with Prov. i. 5; xi. 14; xii. 5, and often; ch. v. 4 ("to be

* Comp. the remarks of Jul. Fürst, *Gesch. der biblischen Literatur und des jüdisch-hellenistischen Schriftthums*, I., p. 37: "As a whole it (the Hebrew language) shows so great stability and unchangeableness, such a stamp of uniformity, that after the period of antiquity no essential modification of it, such as is found in the Indo-European language, can be recognized." And a little further on: "The differences in the three periods of the language affect at most its coloring . . . not the essential structure of the language. An actual progress of the language is accordingly not to be recognized."

crushed in the gate") with Prov. xxii. 22; ch. xv. 16; xxxiv. 7 ("to drink iniquity like water") with Prov. xxvi. 6; similar correspondences in expression might be found with many of the Psalms (comp. Ps. xxxix. 14 with Job ix. 27; x. 20, 21; Ps. lviii. 9 with Job iii. 16; Ps. lxix. 33 with Job xxii. 19; Ps. ciii. 15, 16 with Job vii. 10; xiv. 2); also correspondences with the Aramaisms of the Song of Solomon (comp. the Introd. to the latter, Vol. X. of this Series, p. 14 seq.*). From these, however, it would be scarcely legitimate to infer more than the fact that our book belongs generally to the age of David and Solomon, or at least that its age borders on that.

The inquiry into the age of the poet receives no help from a third witness of an external sort, to wit, the fact that in the well-known passage in the prophet Ezekiel (Ez. xiv. 14, 28; comp. ch. xxviii. 3), Job is mentioned along with Noah and Daniel, as two other examples of wisdom and piety. For this mention would at most furnish a chronological conjecture in regard to the hero of the poem, not at all in regard to the poem itself and its author: even a post-exilic authorship of this poetic version of the story of Job could be reconciled with Ezekiel's use of the name, which moreover does not convey the slightest intimation whether the age of Job was nearer to that of Noah, or to that of Daniel, or whether it should be located somewhere in the middle between the two.

The time when the book was written must accordingly be determined, in the absence of other authoritative external witnesses, on the basis of probability in accordance with *internal* tests. Here we must note, first of all, and as being of essential importance, the Chokma-character of the poem, which we have already exhibited in the preceding section. The opinion that our poem was produced during the bloom of the Literature of Wisdom in Israel in the time of Solomon is made probable by internal evidences of the most weighty character. It is to be preferred to the two theories which differ from it; both to that which carries its authorship back into the Mosaic, or even the pre-Mosaic age, and to that which brings it down near the time of the exile, or even into the post-exilic age.

1. The book is treated as *older* than the epoch of David and Solomon, as belonging indeed to *the Mosaic age*, or even as being the work of *Moses himself*, who composed it before the giving of the law on Sinai, in certain passages of the Talmud (*Sota Jer.* V. 8; *B. Bathra*, 15, *a*), by several of the Church Fathers, such as Origen, Ephraem Syrus, Jerome, Polychronius, Julian of Halicarnassus; by some of the Rabbis, such as Saadia, Aben-Ezra, Kimchi (comp. Hottinger, *Thes. Phil.*, p. 499; Wolf, *Bibl. hebr.* II., p. 102); among later authorities by Huetius (*Demonstratio Ev.* IV., 2, p. 377), J. D. Michaelis, Jahn, Hufnagel, Friedländer, Stier (*The Words of the Lord Jesus*), Ebrard (*Das Buch Hiob übers. und erläutert für Gebildete*, Landau, 1858), Haneberg, J. Gräber (*Die Stellung und Bedentung Hiobs im Alten Testament*, *Beweis des Glaubens*, Bd. V., 1869, p. 433 seq.), Mason, Good, Palfrey, and others [and so Wordsworth, Dr. Mill (quoted by Wordsworth), Elzas, while Canon Cook in SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.* thinks it must have been written before the promulgation of the law, by one speaking the Hebrew language (see also Introd. to Job in Bib. Commentary, p. 14 seq.; Princeton Review, Vol. XXIX., argues that the Mosaic authorship has not been disproved; Carey thinks the exact time cannot be determined, but assigns to it a very great antiquity]. Akin to this is the view of Carpzovius already mentioned (*Introd. in libr. canon. V. T.* II., p. 45 seq.), to wit, that Moses translated from the Aramaic the book which in its original language was yet older than himself [so also Ben Zev; see Preface to Bernard's Commentary, p. LXX., while according to McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopædia*, Art. "Job," it was "originally framed in Job's age (by that romance style of composition spontaneous with Orientals), and that in its Arabic dress it was gathered by Moses from the lips of the Midianitish bards during his residence among them; that it was first composed by him in the Hebrew language, but not reduced to its present complete form till considerably later, perhaps by Solomon"]; also the theory that the book had a pre-Mosaic origin, as held by Ilgen, Bertholdt, Stuhlmann, Eichhorn, and quite lately by E. von Bunsen, who combines with it the singular supposition that

* In respect to the linguistic affinity of our book to the writings of the Solomonic age, and particularly the Proverbs, comp. Michaelis (*Einleitung* I, 92 seq.); Gesenius (*Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift*, p. 33 seq.); Rosenmüller (*Schol.*, p. 38); Hävernick (*Einleitung* III. 353 seq.); also Vaihinger and Hahn in their Commentaries.

Job is identical with Melchizedek (*Die Einheit der Religionen im Zusammenhang mit den Völkerwanderungen der Urzeit und der Geheimlehre*, I. Bd., Berlin, 1870, p. 420 seq.). [Here may be mentioned the opinion of those who think Job himself was the author, *e.g.*, Schultens, Lowth, Peters, Tomline, Hales, Horne, Magee, Lee, Barnes, Croly. Wemyss, who holds this not improbable, adds, as his own conjecture, the name of Joseph.] The attempt has been made to represent the book as approximately Mosaic, as belonging at least to the period of the Judges, by the R. Eliezer (according to *Baba Bathra* 15, and *Sota Jer.* f. 20, 3), and Philippus Presbyter (the author of a pseudo-Jeromean Commentary on Job in *Opp. Hieron.* ed. Vall. T. III., App. p. 895 seq.). All these attempts to assign to the book an exaggerated antiquity, and particularly the hypothesis that Moses was its author, in favor of which may at least be urged such considerations as a certain similarity in many of the descriptions and reflections of the book to Ps. xc. and the song of Moses (Deut. xxx.), are decisively refuted by the following arguments: 1. The reflective, subjective, and artistically perfect character of the poem, which indicates a time considerably later than that of the promulgation of the law. 2. The character of the religious problem of the poem, which, even if it be treated by the poet from an extra-theocratic point of view, pre-supposes nevertheless an accurate acquaintance with the theocracy—nay, more, a profound immersion into its spirit.* 3. The very evident familiarity of the poet with doctrinal representations, which belong only to a stage in the development of revealed religion which was conditioned by the law, and which became possible on the basis of it, such as the idea of Wisdom as a principle of the Divine activity in governing and illuminating the world (chap. xxviii.), and the representation of Sheol as a gloomy, prison-like realm of shadows (chap. iii. 17 seq.; vii. 7 seq.; xiv. 10 seq.; xvi. 21; xvii. 6; xxx. 23). 4. The frequent references to conditions and relations, which pre-suppose a more advanced culture and development in society and the state, than the simple, and, so to speak, elementary conditions of the Mosaic age (comp. chap. ix. 24; xii. 17 seq.; xv. 28; xxiv. 12; xxix. 7; xxxix. 7). 5. Finally, as a peculiarity in the material which points definitely to the period of the first kings, the double mention of the gold of Ophir chap. xxii. 24; xxviii. 16; comp. 1 Kings ix. 28; x. 11).—In view of such manifest traces of a later age, the assignment of the poem to the Mosaic, or to the pre-Mosaic age, or to the age immediately following Moses, seems to be in the highest degree improbable; and Herder is right when, in express opposition to its Mosaic authorship, he says: "The poet of the book of Job is certainly not Moses; we might just as well say that Solon wrote the *Iliad*, and the *Eumenides* of Æschylus!" (*Geist der Ebr. Poesie*, 1805, I., p. 130).

II. Following some of the ancient Rabbis, such as R. Eleazer and R. Jochanan (*B. Bathra* and *Sota Jer.* l. c.), a number of modern exegetes and critics have assigned the poem to an age considerably *later* than that of the literature of David and Solomon; such as Ph. Codurcus (*Annotationes in Jobum*, 1651), who regards it as having been composed by Isaiah in the eighth century; Rosenm. (Schol. ed. 2), Stickel, Ewald, Heiligstedt, Böttcher, Magnus, Bleek, Davidson, Herbst and De Wette (in their Introductions), Renan, Dillmann [Merx], Nöldecke (*Die Alttestamental Literatur.*, 1868, p. 191), Fürst (Gesch., *der bibl. Literat.* II., 424 seq.), and several others, who assign it to the first half of the seventh century, or the age immediately following that of Isaiah [Noyes, and Rodwell, without specifying more closely, place it between the Solomonic age and that of the exile]; Hirzel, who (p. 10 of his Commentary) thinks it was not composed till the end of the seventh century, after the deportation of king Jehoahaz, in the year 608, and that it was written in Egypt; Garnett, Bernstein, Umbreit, Arnheim, who assign it to the period of the Babylonish exile; and Grotius, v. d. Hardt, Le Clerc, Warburton, Heath (*Essay towards a new English version of the Book of Job*, 1755), Gesenius, Vatke, Köster, Br. Bauer, E. Meier (in Baur and Zeller's *Theolog. Jahrbb.*, 1846, p. 129 seq.), Zunz, Bunsen, *etc.*, who look on the post-exilic epoch, and in particular the 5th

* Comp. Hahn, p. 25: "Since the contents of our book are profoundly related to the internal development of the theocracy, while the idea of the connection between sin and suffering, which is objectively advanced by Moses in a form that is altogether general, meets us here not in this general form, nor in that one-sided conception of it which is most nearly related to it, but in a new and broader interpretation, which involves an advance beyond the original form, the book cannot be regarded as having been produced before Moses, nor by Moses, but in a much later period."

Cent. B. C., as the time when it was composed. The two latter modifications of this view represent the extreme limit of the efforts which have been made to bring down the age of the book. They depend on the idea already repudiated in § 4 under *h*, according to which Job is a personification, or at least a type or image of the people of Israel suffering in exile. They stand or fall substantially with this allegoristic interpretation, of which Delitzsch says truly that "it is about the same as the view that the guilty Pericles may be intended by king Oedipus, or the Sophists by the Odysseus of the Philoctetes." And the other arguments urged in favor of the exilic or the post-exilic origin of the poem by such critics as do *not* adhere to this allegoristic theory, or at least are not strenuous in upholding it, have no particular weight. The assumed Aramäistic character of the language is, as has been already shown, to be accredited simply and solely to the poetic contents and dress of the book, and proves nothing therefore in favor of the period of the exile. Just as little do the representations which the book gives of Satan and of the angels prove this; for there is no historical ground whatever for referring these to Chaldee or Persian influences. The theory under consideration is, however, decisively disproved by the fact that the prophet Jeremiah, who lived and prophesied towards the end of the seventh century, must have known our book and made use of it (comp. chap. iii. 3–10 with Jer. xx. 14–18; chap. xix. 24 with Jer. xvii. 1; chap. xxi. 19 with Jer. xxxi. 29; also chap. xix. 8 with Lam. iii. 7, 9; chap. xii. 4; xvii. 6; xxx. 1 with Lam. ii. 15). Far more weight should be assigned to these correspondences with Jeremiah, especially seeing that Jeremiah is obviously the copyist, the book of Job being the original, than to the twofold mention of Job by Ezekiel (comp. above); or to the correspondences, which are far less certain and indisputable, between this book and the second part of Isaiah (comp. chap. xxi. 22 with Isa. xl. 14; chap. xii. 24 with Isa. xl. 23; chap. xii. 17, 20 with Isa. xliv. 25; chap. ix. 8; xxxviii. 4 with Isa. xliv. 24; chap. xv. 35 with Isa. lix. 4). This undeniable dependence of Jeremiah on the author of this book is at the same time decisive also against the opinion of Hirzel that our book was produced in the age immediately before the exile, say under Jehoahaz; an opinion which is still further refuted by the fact that the passage in chap. xv. 18 seq. describes not at all the invasion of Palestine by foreign oriental nationalities, but rather foreign incursions over-running the original inhabitants of Edom or Teman (the country of Eliphaz). And so in general it may be said that the references to the condition of the Israelitish people and kingdom as one of confusion and incipient ruin, which not only Hirzel, but De Wette, Stickel, Ewald, and others find in the book, are without any foundation in fact, and can by no means be supported by such passages as chap. ix. 24; xii. 6, 14 seq.; xxi. 7, 16 seq.; xxiv. 1 seq. (comp. the exegetical remarks).

There remains only that modification of the opinion that the book has a post-Solomonic origin, which conjectures its date as being the first half of the seventh century, or the age of Manasseh (696–643), and which has been defended with particular acuteness by Ewald, Dillmann, Fürst, Davidson, Schrader, *etc.* It is the most plausible of the theories advanced by modern criticism regarding the age of the book; at the same time there is much which argues against it, and which points to an earlier period:

a. Already does Isaiah even, in several passages, and especially in chap. xix., show familiarity with the book of Job (comp. in particular Isa. xix. 5 with Job xiv. 11; Isa. xix. 13, 14 with Job xii. 24 seq.); nay, the book of Amos, which is considerably older yet, exhibits several allusions to this book, which lead us to regard it as older than that (comp. Amos iv. 13 with Job ix. 8; Amos v. 8 with Job ix. 9; xxxviii. 31; Amos ix. 6 with Job xii. 9; and see Vaihinger in the *Stud. und Krit.*, 1846, I., p. 146 seq.; also Schlottmann, p. 109). The opinion that, on the contrary, these passages in the prophetic books are older than the corresponding passages in our poem (an opinion which, *e. g.*, Volck [*De summa carm. Job sententia*] has advanced in respect to those passages in Isaiah), is in most cases improbable, and in some absolutely untenable. Comp. below on chap. xiv. 11.

b. The verbal correspondences already noted between this book and that of *Proverbs* indicate that in all probability the book was composed in the Solomonic age, or at least not far from the same; and this conclusion is rendered all the more certain by the fact that those correspondences occur only to a limited extent with the introductory chapters (1–9) of the

Book of Proverbs (which chapters properly belong to the age immediately following Hezekiah; see Vol. X. of this Series, Introd., p. 26 seq.), the great majority of them being related to the old Solomonic nucleus of the collection, chap. x.—xxii.

c. Several more definite correspondences of thought and expression, which occur between this book and that of Proverbs (both in its older and its later divisions), cause the priority of Job to seem more probable and natural. Comp. chap. xv. 7 with Prov. viii. 25; chap. xxi. 17 with Prov. xiii. 9; xx. 20; xxiv. 20; chap. xxviii. 18 with Prov. iii. 15. Here it is of particular importance to consider the relation of Wisdom in chap. xxviii. of our book to the descriptions of the same Divine Principle in the government of the world and in revelation given in chapters iii., viii., and ix. of Proverbs; a relation which clearly exhibits a course of development as obtaining between the two representations, a progress from the less developed idea of the Chokmah in Job to its more full doctrinal unfolding in the introductory part of the book of Proverbs, and which accordingly proves the age of the earlier book to be that of Solomon, or at least the age immediately following.

d. That the traces of serious doubt respecting the retributive justice of God, which our book exhibits, are of necessity to be regarded as signs of a post-Solomonic origin, "of its origin even in the time of the later kings," is an unproved assumption, which has been advanced by Ewald, Dillmann, and several others, and which involves a *petitio principii*, resting on no objective fact. In this respect it resembles the similar proposition which has been advanced touching the poetic form of the book, to wit, that as a specimen of religious-didactic poetry, it must be of necessity considerably later than the "dramatizing popular poetry" of the Canticles, it "presupposes a longer practice of the religious lyric art, and of proverbial poetry, and cannot accordingly be placed at the beginning of the same" (Dillmann, p. XXVI.).

e. The descriptions already referred to in chapters ix., xii., xxi., and xxiv. (particularly in chap. xii. 14 seq., xxi. 16 seq.; and xxiv. 1 seq.) by no means prove, as is often assumed, that grievous catastrophes, such as destructive raids by powerful hostile armies, deportations of entire masses of men, *etc.*, are assumed as having already overtaken Israel, and that accordingly the poem must have been composed after the Assyrian invasions in the eighth century before Christ. For in the history of the nations of Western Asia catastrophes of that sort are in general "as old as the traditions of history" (think of Chedor-laomer, of Sesostris, of Shishak, 1 Kings xiv. 25 seq.), and the supposition that those passages necessarily referred to the country and the nation of the Israelites is unfounded, and in fact is altogether irreconcilable with the geographical territory contemplated in the book, which is predominantly that of the Idumean Arabia. "The assumption that a book which sets forth such a fearful conflict in the abyss of affliction, as the book of Job, must have sprung from a time of gloomy national distress, is untenable. It is sufficient to suppose that the writer himself has experienced the like, and experienced it at a time when all around him were living in great luxury, which must have greatly aggravated his trial" (Delitzsch, I., p. 20).

f. It is still further an arbitrary assumption to say that "the contest of principles between the two parties, the pious and the unbelieving," as the same is described in chap. xvii. 8, and chap. xxii. 19 is of necessity to be taken as indicating a later age. This view is just as destitute of any certain external support, as the theory, pressed into its support, that those Psalms, which contain allusions to similar party-contests (comp., *e. g.*, Ps. xxxix. 14 [13] with Job ix. 27; x. 20; Ps. lviii. 9 [8] with Job iii. 16; Ps. lxix. 33 with Job xxii. 19, *etc.*), were composed after the time of David, or even near the time of the exile. The same may be said of the other supposed indications of the time of the later kings, on which Dillmann lays stress, *l. c.*, to wit, "star-worship, with its seductive influence," the mention of which in ch. xxxi. 26 seq., it is said, points expressly to the times of Ahaz, and still more of Manasseh (as though even in the pre-Mosaic and the Mosaic age this kind of idolatry was not known, and warnings uttered against it; comp. above, § 2); also the fact that a written process and a written judgment are presupposed in judicial cases in chap. xiii. 26; xxxi. 35 seq. (as though the סֹפְרִים in the royal court of David were not already accustomed to complete written procedures in administrative, and certainly also in judicial, matters!).

III. The reasons above given are predominantly negative and indirect, designed to weaken the force of the objections to the opinion that the book of Job proceeds from the Solomonic age. The following are the positive arguments in favor of this opinion, which has been maintained by R. Nathan (*B. Bathra*, f. 15; *Sota Jer.* 20, 3), by Gregory of Nazianzen (*Or.* IX.), Luther, Spanheim, Harduin, Döderlein, Stäudlin, Richter (*De ætate l. Job definienda*, 1799, § 11), Augusti, Hävernick, Keil, Oehler, Welte, Vaihinger, Schlottmann, Hahn, Delitzsch, *etc.* [so also A. B. Davidson, Hengstenberg, while Stanley, *Hist. of the Jewish Church,* Lecture XXVIII., regards its "derivation from the age of Solomon" as very evident].

g. The double mention of the gold of Ophir (see above, No. I., 5), which is most easily explained by supposing that the poets in their figurative language would most naturally make use of this costly natural product of the Oriental world of wonders just at the time when it was first brought in considerable quantities to the Shemitic countries of Western Asia (comp. also Ps. xlv. 10 [9]).

h. The mention of so many other notable natural objects, costly articles, rare and splendid jewels, *etc.;* the description of which is characterized by an exuberant abundance of observations in the natural world, and of indications showing that sense and spirit were satiated with the enjoyment of life, a warm, agreeable fullness of life, such as was quite peculiar to the time of Solomon, and which, outside of our poem, is especially apparent in the Canticles, whose observations of the world exhibit a cosmopolitan wealth of material, and whose coloring in the domain of natural description is glowing and splendid. Comp. the rare animals and the other natural wonders described in chap. xxx. 29, and chap. xxxix. 13—chap. xli.; also the mention of pearls (corals) and other costly treasures in chap. xxviii.; and with these comp. such passages as Cant. iii. 9; iv. 3, 13; vi. 7; vii. 2 seq.; also Prov. iii. 15; viii. 11; xx. 15; xxxi. 10; 1 Kings v. 13; vii. 13 seq.; x. 11 seq. (see Introd. to Song of Solomon, Vol. X. of this Series, p. 13, and also p. 384 of this volume).

i. The many correspondences found especially in *the eschatological representations* of our book, and especially in its utterances concerning the conditions of men after death, and to the realm of shadows (שְׁאוֹל), with that which the Proverbs, and many of the Psalms belonging to the best period, teach in respect to these points (comp. אֲבַדּוֹן, abyss, in the sense of שְׁאוֹל, Prov. xv. 11, and Job xxvi. 6; xxviii. 22; and also the many correspondences of our book with the Lamentation-Psalms of the Ezrahites, Heman and Ethan, Ps. lxxxviii., lxxxix., especially Ps. lxxxviii. 5 with Job xiv. 6; Ps. lxxxviii. 9 [8] with Job xxx. 10; Ps. lxxxix. 8 [7] with Job xxxi. 34; Ps. lxxxix. 48 [47] with Job vii. 7; Ps. lxxxix. 49 [48] with Job xiv. 14):—in short its agreement with the eschatology of the time of David and Solomon (comp. above, p. 247), which, along with that which has been remarked repeatedly in respect to its essential harmony with the doctrine of God and the doctrine of Wisdom, constitutes a consideration of no small weight.

k. Finally, the classic, magnificent form of the poem as *a work of art* (§ 3), which in the eyes of every unprejudiced observer gives to it a position immediately alongside of the Canticles, the Solomonic nucleus of the Book of Proverbs, and the best and oldest portions of the Book of Psalms, even though by this course we multiply the classical products of the literary epoch represented by David and Solomon to a degree which is astonishing, or even almost incredible.* If any concession be made to one of the weightiest arguments by which the post-Solomonic authorship is sustained, the frequent reference to great public calamities, and severe national afflictions (see under *e*), we might come down to the age immediately following that of Solomon, or we might say with the editor of this Series (Vol. I., Introd. to the Old Testament, p. 35 seq.): "The origin of the book belongs to the time when the glory of

* Comp. Delitzsch, I., p. 21: "The book bears throughout the creative stamp of that opening period of the Chokmah,—of that Solomonic age of knowledge and art, of deeper thought respecting revealed religion, and of intelligent progressive culture of the traditional forms of art,—that unprecedented age, in which the literature corresponded to the summit of glorious magnificence to which the kingdom of the promise had then attained . . . a time when the chasm between Israel and the nations was more than ever bridged over . . . a time introductory to the extension of redemption, and the triumph of the religion of Israel, and the union of all nations in faith in the God of love."

Solomon was on the decline." In the main however we must rest satisfied with the view that the book, both as to its character and its age, belongs to the group of Solomonic poems of Wisdom, and Luther's judgment in the Table-Talk is anything but a blunder; on the contrary it substantially hits the nail on the head: "It is possible and supposable that Solomon composed and wrote this book, for we find just his way of speaking in the Book of Job, as in his other books. *Phrasis non multum est dissimilis.* The story of Job is old, and was quite familiar to everybody in Solomon's time, and he undertook to describe it, as though I should undertake to describe the stories of Joseph or Rebecca."

§ 7. NATIONALITY AND HOME OF THE POET.

The country and home of the author of our poem has been treated in much the same way as the age in which he lived. Many one-sided and untenable conjectures have been advanced which require to be refuted, or, at least, reduced to their proper value.

The same confusion which has produced the attempt to identify the age of the poet with that of Job has also largely prevailed in respect to the place where the one and the other lived. According as the land of Uz has been assigned to the territory of Aramaic Syria, or Arabia, or Idumea, the attempt has been made to represent our book as an extra-Palestinian production, as to its language, its conception, and its entire origin. Its authorship has been variously referred to Syria (the LXX., the Pseudo-Origen's *Comm. in Job,* Aben Ezra), to Arabia (Spanheim, Vitringa, Witsius, Joh. Gerhard, Calovius, also Kromayer: *Filia matri obstetricans h. e. de usu linguæ arab. in addiscenda ebræa,* p. 72), or to Edomitis (Herder, Ilgen), or to a Nahorite, *i. e.*, a Mesopotamian (Niemeyer, *Charakteristik der Bibel,* II., 480 seq.). Perceiving the extravagance of these hypotheses, Bertholdt and Eichhorn limited themselves to the assumption that the author was an Israelite, sojourning in Idumea or Arabia—an opinion against which it has been correctly observed that it "results from confounding the scene of the book with the author's standpoint, which is wholly independent of the same" (Hahn, p. 22). A bolder conjecture, and yet, in view of certain remarkable peculiarities, a more plausible one, is that of Hitzig (*Komment. zu Jesaia,* 1813, p. 285), and of Hirzel (*Komment.,* p. 12), that the book was written in Egypt, that is to say, by a Hebrew living in Egypt. Hirzel, in particular, finds reasons for this opinion in various traces of a familiar acquaintance on the part of the poet with Egyptian objects, an acquaintance which is presumed to have been founded on his own observation. Among these he names the description of mining in chap. xxviii. 1–11, which, as he claims, indicates personal knowledge of the gold mines of Egypt (Diodorus III. 12; Josephus, *De bello Jud.* VI. 912); acquaintance with the Nile, as shown in chap. vii. 12; viii. 11–13; ix. 26; the mention of mausoleums in chap. iii. 14; the reference to the Egyptian process in judicial cases in chap. xxxi. 35; the allusion to the phenix in chap. xxix. 18; and finally the description of the war-horse in chap. xxxix. 19 seq., and of the still more specifically Egyptian animal prodigies, the hippopotamus and the crocodile in chap. xl. and xli. These reasons, however, will be found inconclusive. Either they rest on a false or doubtful exegesis, or they prove only so much familiarity with Egypt as might have been acquired by traveling in that land, or even by mere hearsay.

a. There is no foundation whatever for referring the passage in ch. vii. 12 to the Nile, the passage in ch. xxxi. 35 to the judicial processes of the Egyptians (comp. what is said above in the preceding section, under II.), or the passage in chap. xxxix. 19 seq. specifically to the *Egyptian* war-horse. As though the use of cavalry and the breeding of horses were not abundantly practised in Palestine, especially after the time of Solomon (comp. 1 Kings v. 6 seq. [iv. 26 seq.]; ix. 19; x. 28)!

b. It is questionable whether by the mausoleums or "ruins" (חֳרָבוֹת) of ch. iii. 14, the author had particularly in mind *Egyptian* mausoleums, for instance the pyramids, seeing that Palestine might easily have made him acquainted with structures of that kind (comp. Is. xxii 15 seq.; Josephus, *De B. Jud.* I. 2, 5), and seeing that the exegesis of the passage is very uncertain (see on the verse). In like manner it is exceedingly questionable whether his description of mining in ch. xxviii. is necessarily derived from the Egyptian gold-diggings.

For, in the first place, his description by no means refers exclusively to the mining of gold, but includes just as much the mining of silver, iron and copper (see ver. 2 seq.), and also the mining of precious stones, among which he expressly mentions the sapphire. In the next place, the comprehensiveness of his acquaintance with mining operations makes it more probable that he had in mind the iron, gold, lead and copper mines of Idumea and Arabia, as well as the sapphire veins of the last mentioned country, the existence of which is attested by antiquity, provided, that is, that the source of his knowledge is to be looked for in any foreign mines. For it is certainly not easy to see why the business of mining should not have been carried on within the limits of Palestine itself, at least from the time of the first kings, and indeed from the age of Moses, in view of such direct testimony as is furnished by Deut. viii. 9; xxxiii. 25; as well as of such figures and poetic similes as are found in Prov. xvii. 3; xxvi. 23; xxvii. 21; Isa. i. 22; Ezek. xxii. 18; Mal. iii. 3, *etc.* Comp. Robinson's *Physical Geography of the Holy Land*, pp. 340, 373; v. Rougemont, *Die Bronzezeit, etc.* (1869), p. 87. And finally, it is just as doubtful whether the mention of the phenix in chap. xxix. 18 (admitting that חול there really has that meaning, and should not rather be rendered "sand"), must of necessity be understood and explained in accordance with the *Egyptian* legend of the phenix, seeing that the legend of this bird is rather to be regarded as the common property of the *orbis orientalis,* and may in particular be attributed to the Arabians as a part of their primitive heritage; comp. Herodot. II. 73; Tacit. *Ann.* VI. 28; Clemens Rom., 1 Cor. chap. xxv., *etc.;* also Henrichsen, *De Phœnicis fabula apud Græcos, Romanos et populos orientales,* Part I., II., Havniæ, 1825, 1827; Piper, *Mythologie der christl. Kunst,* 1847, I. 446 seq.

c. The passages (chap. viii. 11 seq.) which describe the papyrus-shrub (which is to be found predominantly indeed along the Nile, but which, according to Theophrastus, *Hist. plant.* 4, 9, grows also in Palestine), and the papyrus-boat (chap. ix. 26), furnish no sufficient demonstration that the author lived in Egypt. They are rather to be explained by supposing simply that he became acquainted with these objects through travel, or indirectly through oral tradition. Even Isaiah recognizes the papyrus-boats, although he had never himself seen Egypt or the Nile! Moreover, the descriptions of the hippopotamus and the crocodile, contained in Jehovah's discourses, do not by any means unqualifiedly require us to suppose on the part of the poet the accurate knowledge of an eye-witness. Rather do they seem, "not only by their ideal cast, but also by the inaccuracies which have slipped into them, to betray an author who possibly knew the animals referred to only through what he had heard concerning them. For which reason the opinion of Eichhorn, Ewald, Dillmann, and Simson—an opinion which is, in other respects, without sufficient critical foundation—that these descriptions, constituting the whole section embraced in chap. xl. 15—xli. 26 [34], were written by a Jew, who, about the beginning of the 6th century, travelled to Egypt, and lived there, seems superfluous. Comp. § 9, II., and also the exposition of the particular section referred to.

The positive proof that Palestine was the author's country and home, lies, first of all, on the external side, in the fact that, in the section just mentioned, describing behemoth and leviathan, the Jordan is introduced as an example of a great river (see chap. xl. 23); on the internal side, in the unmistakable fact that as respects his whole manner of thought and perception the author stood in intimate relationship to the consciousness and life of the theocracy, which could scarcely have been the case had he lived outside the national territory of the theocratic commonwealth, and at a distance from its sanctuary. Through travel in foreign lands, perhaps in Egypt, Arabia, Syria, and especially in Idumea and the regions immediately adjacent, in which the principal theatre of his narrative lies, he might at any time have acquired the information which he exhibits respecting the peculiarities of these lands outside of Palestine. In the main, however, the comprehensive knowledge, and the vast wealth of vivid natural observations, of which his poem gives evidence, are to be explained by the universal cosmopolitanism of his intellectual tendencies, and by the extent and solidity of his entire culture, which in a sage of the Solomonic age is not to be wondered at. The abundance of the "secular knowledge" deposited in the book appears essentially as "the result of the wide circle of observation which Israel had reached in the time of Solomon" (De-

litzsch). And there is no really unanswerable argument to show that this sage, highly cultivated and richly endowed, like Solomon himself (comp. 1 Kings iv. 30 seq.; v. 10 seq.), of necessity lived far from Solomon's court, and from what were in that age the central points of the theocratic national life of Israel, and that we must look to the remote south, or south-east of that famed land, the region bordering on Idumea, for his place of residence. When Stickel, Vaihinger (*Stud. und Krit.*, 1846, I., 178 seq.), Böttcher (*Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache*, § 29 and 36), and Dillmann present arguments to establish the probability that he lived in Southern Palestine, derived from the language and from other sources, not one of these arguments is of sufficient weight to prove more than the bare possibility of this hypothesis. For—

(1) The statement that the book "exhibits so many Aramaic and Arabic peculiarities of diction," as to indicate that the author's home bordered on the territory where the Aramaic and Arabian languages were spoken, must be adjudged to be exceedingly precarious, after what we have said above in the preceding section in respect to the value of linguistic peculiarities for the more precise determination of the question touching the origin of our book. It would seem to be equally precarious with the well-known opinion of Hitzig and Ewald, that the Song of Solomon had its origin in *Northern* Palestine, on account of its numerous Aramaisms (comp. the Introduction to our Commentary of the Song of Solomon, Vol. X. of this Series, § 3, Rem. 2, p. 14 seq.).

(2) The absence of any definite references to Jerusalem, as the centre of the Israelitish cultus is sufficiently explained by the author's purpose to locate the scene of the action outside of Palestine, and in a patriarchal, pre-Mosaic sphere, and to adhere to this plan with rigid consistency throughout (comp. § 5).

(3) The exact familiarity of the author with the conditions and phenomena of life in the desert by no means necessitates the conclusion that his home bordered on the desert; for even in the country immediately surrounding Jerusalem, and in the whole Israelitish territory east of the Jordan, the life of the desert might be studied in all its peculiarities, and our author shows himself throughout to be in every respect a poet endowed with a rich poetic fancy and talent for description, a man in whom was to be found, according to Stickel's own confession, "a plastic genius so manifest and powerful that he was competent to give a true description of what he had not seen with his own eyes."

(4) Just as little does the author's knowledge of the animal prodigies of Egypt and Arabia, of the costly products of these lands, and also of the star-worship prevailing in these and in other oriental countries, compel us to suppose that "he lived in the centre of the most active commercial intercourse between the nations of Arabia, Egypt and Babylonia, at the point where the great commercial routes from the Euphrates and Eastern Arabia to Egypt and the Philistine and maritime ports, and again from Southern Arabia to Damascus and Palmyra crossed." For under the peaceful reign of Solomon, with its complete organization and close centralization, even a resident of Jerusalem might have acquired a vivid conception and exact information respecting all those things. Especially would he be able, as the result of the active commercial relations, which, according to 1 Kings v. 1 seq., x. 1 seq., Solomon had established with Egypt, Arabia and Phenicia, to extend the circle of his observation over all that territory, even although he himself never had occasion to journey along the caravan-routes of the south-east, or to live there for any length of time.

It is not necessary accordingly to assume for the poet either an extra-Israelitish origin or place of abode, or a residence on the boundaries of the land of Israel in the neighborhood of Edom, or of the Syro-Arabian desert. On the contrary all that we find in his poem is most satisfactorily explained on the theory that he belonged to the pious and literary coterie of sages, whose rendezvous, according to 1 Kings iv. 30 seq., was Solomon's court, and that the classification of the actors in his poem with the wise "sons of the east," and the "Egyptians" (comp. § 5) rests simply on the fact that his unusually wide circle of observation, and his comprehensive knowledge of nature and mankind had put him in possession of a more intimate acquaintance with the practices and habits and circle of ideas peculiar to these extra-theocratic sages. The conjecture of Delitzsch (I. p. 23) that the author of our

book might have been Heman, the Ezrahite, the singer of "the 88th Psalm, written under circumstances of suffering similar to Job's," is indeed lacking in any more precise support, whether in the poem itself, or in the scanty intimations conveyed by the Books of the Kings respecting the person of this Heman. For which reason Delitzsch himself does not follow up this conjecture any further, but contents himself with the conclusion respecting the author's probable nationality which we have stated above, and which there are scarcely counter-arguments of sufficient weight to overthrow.

[WAS HEZEKIAH THE AUTHOR OF JOB?]

After all that has been written on the question of the authorship of the Book of Job, the suggestion of a new solution of the problem may well seem superfluous. On the one side the question itself may be deemed unimportant; on the other side the solution of it may be pronounced impracticable, and a new conjecture but one more contribution to the limbo of idle speculation. It must be admitted however that if the question—who wrote the book of Job?—ever should receive an answer sustained by a reasonable array of probabilities, such an answer would be of no small value in elucidating the book itself, and the historic revelation of Divine truth, of which it is so important a part. The answer here suggested is one that has suggested itself to the translator during the progress of the work with singular force, and with an accumulating weight of probability, in view of which he feels justified in at least propounding the above inquiry—*Was Hezekiah the author of the Book of Job?* and in inviting attention to the considerations which incline him to an affirmative answer, and which he ventures to presume may serve to show that the inquiry is not altogether an unreasonable one.

It may be true that the author of this book will ever continue to be a "Great Unknown." It may be that the Spirit of inspiration has purposely withheld from the sacred volume every such clue to his personal identity, as would place it beyond all question. If so it is undoubtedly better that it should be so. I am certainly very far from wishing to dogmatize on the subject. I simply suggest the name of Hezekiah as a hypothesis worthy of consideration. That hitherto the name seems to have occurred to no one is, I admit, a presumption against it. All the more so perhaps that some have come so near it, hovering all about it, yet never alighting upon it. Thus Warburton says of Job xxxiii. 17 seq.: "This is the most circumstantial account of God's dealing with Hezekiah, as it is told in the books of Chronicles and of Kings;" and of Job xxxiv. 20, that "it plainly refers to the destruction of the first-born in Egypt, and Sennacherib's army ravaging Judea." Ewald, speaking of the remarkable epoch of which Hezekiah is the central and commanding figure, says that the culture of the highest form of poetry, the drama, during this period, is shown by the book of Job, which exhibits the highest point reached by the poetic art of the nation in ancient times. Merx finds his theory as to the time when the book was composed (*viz* about 700 B. C.) confirmed by the existence of the College of Sages, established by Hezekiah, "the poet's contemporary" (*Das Buch Hiob*, p. XLVI.). Renan "loves to place the book" in the same period, and finds "*rapports*" between the psalm of Hezekiah and the book of Job. Carey, speaking of the case instanced by Elihu in chap. xxxiii. 24 seq. says: "This case is not unlike that of Hezekiah; indeed it so resembles it in many particulars that I wonder it should have escaped (as I believe it has done) the notice of commentators." To no one of these however does the thought seem to have occurred that Hezekiah himself may have been the author—and yet why not? Let me submit the following considerations in favor at least of having the claims of Hezekiah considered.

1. Hezekiah was a gifted poet. This no one can doubt who is familiar with that most beautiful Ode which Isaiah has preserved for us in chap. xxxviii. 9 seq. Its exquisite melody, its plaintive pathos, its depth of sentiment, its beauty of imagery, its devotional tenderness have never been surpassed within the same compass. Zwingli has said of it truly: *est autem carmen hoc cum primis doctum et elegans.* Delitzsch acknowledges its "lofty sweep," although he calls it "cultivated rather than original poetry." The criticism proceeds however from the manifest presupposition that the song is an imitation of Job, having,

he says, "a considerable number of the echoes of the book of Job." But what if instead of being an echo, it is the keynote of Job? What if here we have the germ of that wondrous creation? If at least with Ewald, Renan and Merx we attribute it to the age of Hezekiah, whom shall we find more likely or more worthy to be the author of it than the royal poet himself?

2. The remarkable correspondences of thought and expression between this Ode and the book of Job are most striking and significant. These, as we see, have been recognized by such competent critics as Renan and Delitzsch, and indeed they lie on the surface. Note in particular the following:

In Is. xxxviii. 10 compare the phrase שַׁעֲרֵי שְׁאוֹל with בַּדֵּי שְׁאֹל in Job xvii. 16, each phrase involving the same conception of the entrance to Sheol.

In ver. 11 the phrase אֶרֶץ הַחַיִּים, found also in Job xxviii. 13. In the same verse note the idea of life as "seeing," or "being seen of men," so common in Job (see ch. vii. 8; viii. 18; x. 18; xx. 9). If, with Gesenius, Rosenmüller, Delitzsch, Noyes, Wordsworth, we take חֶדֶל to mean the rest, cessation, of the grave, we have a thought which occurs repeatedly in Job in such passages as iii. 17; xiv. 6.

In ver. 12, compared with Job iv. 21, observe the use of נִסַּע, for the removal of man by death, involving a comparison to the removal of the tent with its pins and cord. The comparison of life to the weaver's thread is also common in Job, especially in the use of the verb בצע, as in ch. vi. 9; xxvii. 8 (perhaps). Compare also ch. vii. 6. The expression "from day to night" finds its exact parallel in Job iv. 20 in "from morning to evening," *i. e.* in one day, quickly.

In ver. 13 the comparison of God to a lion, fiercely assailing and rending the sufferer, reminds us forcibly of Job x. 16 and xvi. 9; comp. ix. 17 and xvi. 14. How vividly, moreover, do the sleepless apprehensions and anguish of the night, as described in this clause, remind us of such passages as Job vii. 3, 4, 13–15.

In ver. 14 the moanings referred to remind us of Job iii. 24; the clause דלו עיני למרום of אל־אלוה דלפה עיני in Job xvi. 20; and the remarkable clause עָרְבֵנִי, "be bail for me," is exactly reproduced in Job xvii. 3, שִׂימָה נָּא עָרְבֵנִי עִמָּךְ.

In ver. 15 the expression מַר נַפְשִׁי is characteristic of Job (see ch. iii. 20; vii. 11; x. 1).

In ver. 16 the peculiar adverbial use of בָּהֶן reminds us of בָּהֶם in Job xxii. 21.

In vers. 17 and 18 the expressions שחת־בלי and יורדי־בור may be compared with Job xvii. 16; xxxiii. 22, 24.

The view of Sheol in ver. 18 is quite in harmony with that expressed by Job in ch. x. 21, 22.

It would assuredly be difficult to find in any part of Scripture of the same length so many, and for the most part unique, correspondences with any other part, as those here exhibited. If Hezekiah did not write the book of Job, he had certainly saturated his mind with its thought and phraseology in a remarkable degree.

3. The correspondences just mentioned are not the only indications of a common source for these two compositions. The essential mental and literary characteristics of each are largely the same. There are differences indeed in the metrical movement, as might be expected from the difference in the nature and object of the two compositions, the one being a Psalm to be sung on the *negînoth* in the temple, the other a lyrico-dramatic composition, adapted rather to rhetoric recital. In the former accordingly the verse-lines are longer and more sustained, in the latter shorter and more concise. Apart from this, however, the same artistic skill characterizes the execution of both, the same exquisite modulation of rhythm, now softly flowing and melodious, as in vers. 10, 11, 17, now abrupt and urgent, as in vers. 12, 13, 16. There is the same occasional terse obscurity of construction and expression, as in vers. 13, 15, 16; the same emphatic iteration of words and clauses, as in vers. 10, 17, 19 (and comp. Job ix. 20 *b*, 21 *a;* x. 22, *etc.*); the same strong contrasts and sudden transitions, as in vers. 15 seq. compared with the verses preceding (and comp. Job xix. 23 seq. with vers. preceding). The limited compass and special scope of the Psalm indeed of necessity limit the scope of the writer's genius; but to the close observer it is really remarkable how many

of the characteristics of the book of Job reproduce themselves in this Ode. No minor poem of Milton's exhibits more, or more decided traces of the art of Paradise Lost. In the first half of the Ode we have the sombre gloom, the plaintive pathetic tone of the earlier discourses of Job, the wail of a suffering, crushed, almost a despairing heart. In ver. 13, however, there is a flash, faint indeed, yet unmistakable of that Titanic audacity with which Job ventures to arraign the pitiless severity of God in His treatment of him. Observe the vague reserve, in the very manner of Job, with which he avoids naming his Divine Assailant: "So will *He* break all my bones." In the latter half of the Psalm again the tender brightness of the picture reflects those passages in Job where the sufferer emerges from the darkness of the conflict into the hope of future deliverance, or where his friends seek to win him to repentance by depicting such a deliverance, or, in particular, where Elihu describes the restoration of the penitent sufferer (Job xxxiii. 24 seq.). We find even that marked characteristic of the book of Job to multiply illustrations from the animal world (see ver. 14). The same conception of a redeemed life as a life of song and praise which pervades the closing verses of Hezekiah's Psalm, exhibits itself once and again in Elihu's discourse, as when in ch. xxxiii. 27 he says: "He will sing (יָשֹׁר) to men, and say," *etc.*, or when in ch. xxxvi. 24, he exhorts Job, saying: "Remember that thou exalt His work, which men have sung repeatedly" (שֹׁרְרוּ). These peculiarities would seem to be too deeply rooted in the mental individuality from which these productions have proceeded to be the result of accident, of conscious imitation, or of unconscious influence. If there is anywhere in Scripture a literary clue to the authorship of this book, where shall we look for one more satisfactory than is here furnished us?

Passing on from this Ode of Hezekiah, we shall next find in the facts of his life and personal experience, in the psychological traits of his character which history reveals, and in the circumstances of his time, most suggestive hints pointing us to him as the author.

4. Most important of these facts in Hezekiah's life is his fatal sickness and miraculous restoration as recorded in 2 Kings xx. 1 seq.; 2 Chron. xxxii. 24 seq.; Is. xxxviii. 1 seq.—Here is communicated first of all the fact that for an indefinite space of time Hezekiah was brought face to face with death. He contemplated it as imminent and inevitable. He passed through the strange experience of one for whom the grave was ready. Now if anything is certain in regard to the authorship of the book of Job, it is that it was written, as Merx says, "with the author's heart blood." The author of Job's discourses had, we may be sure, passed through the mental, if not the physical throes of dying. Such passages as we find in chs. x., xiv., xvii. (see vers. 1, 13 seq., particularly), xxxiii. (vers. 22 seq.), have a reality about them such as belongs to experience, rather than imagination. Death and the Hereafter have for the poet an awful fascination which he cannot resist, the secret of which becomes intelligible only by the stern announcement of an Isaiah to the writer: "Set thine house in order, for thou shalt die, and not live."

5. The passages referred to, and others in the book, become still more significant in view of the particular malady which threatened the life of the poet-king. According to 2 Kings xx. 7 (Isa. xxxviii. 21), he was afflicted with "a boil," or "boils," שְׁחִין, which may be taken either as singular, "tumor," or as a collective, "boils." But the very same word is used in describing Job's malady (ch. ii. 7), where it is said that Satan smote Job בִּשְׁחִין, "with boils." Now it is not necessary to assume that Hezekiah was, like Job, smitten with leprosy, or that the שְׁחִין from which he suffered was precisely the same with that from which Job suffered. It is enough that the fatal disease which afflicted him was accompanied by a painful and offensive eruption, by a tumor, or boils. Would not this explain the terrible vividness with which the poet enters into all the physical experiences of Job's disease, its pain, restlessness, offensiveness, *etc.*, as described in chs. vi., vii., xvi., xvii., xix., xxx.?

But the significance which attaches to the general character of the disease is still further enhanced by several of the details of Hezekiah's sickness, especially when compared with Job xxxiii. 14 seq., a passage of which Warburton and Carey have both remarked (see above) that it presents most striking analogies to the case of Hezekiah

6. One of the leading lessons of the book of Job, and one that is prominently inculcated in the discourse of Elihu is that God's dealings with men are disciplinary, designed to try,

teach, and purify them. So it is said in 2 Chron. xxxii. 31 that God left Hezekiah, "to *try him*, that he might know *all that was in his heart*." This indeed was after his sickness, but the principle is the same, and it is at least remarkable that this fundamental thought of the book of Job is emphasized as a fact of special significance in the life of Hezekiah.

7. Still more specifically Elihu declares that the purpose of God in sending affliction on man is to deliver him from *pride* (Job xxxiii. 17). According to 2 Chron. xxxii. 25, 26, this was the besetting sin of Hezekiah. According to the poet's conception it was evidently to be regarded as a leading trait in the character of Job, the radical sin which Jehovah rebuked (chap. xl. 7 seq.), and for which Job humbled himself (chap. xlii. 2 seq.).

8. According to Elihu man's insensibility and wilfulness make it necessary that God should afflict him once and twice, *i. e.*, repeatedly, before His chastisements work out their proper result (chap. xxxiii. 14, 29). According to 2 Chron. xxxii. 25, 26, 31, God visited Hezekiah more than once with His displeasure before he humbled himself aright before Him.

9. Isaiah was sent to the king in his sickness with the message—"Set thine house in order, for thou shalt die, and not live." And in his Ode Hezekiah represents himself as saying: "In the quiet (or perhaps: middle, meridian) of my days I must go to the gates of Sheol." How perfectly does this correspond with the description of Elihu (xxxiii. 22): "His soul draweth near unto the grave, and his life to the destroyers."—So again in speaking of his recovery, Hezekiah says beautifully: "Thou hast loved my soul out of the pit of destruction" (Isa. xxxviii. 17). In like manner Elihu represents the restored one as singing: "He has redeemed my soul from going into the pit" (Job xxxiii. 28).

10. On receiving the prophet's message, the king turned his face toward the wall, and prayed to Jehovah, and Jehovah graciously accepted his prayer. So with touching beauty Elihu describes the restored sufferer: "He shall pray unto Jehovah, and He will be favorable unto him" (xxxiii. 26).

11. It is said of Hezekiah that "he wept a great weeping" (Isa. xxxviii. 3, and comp. ver. 14: "mine eyes fail [with looking] upward"). So Job describes his excessive weeping (chap. xvi. 16, 20; xvii. 7).

12. God sent Isaiah as His messenger to announce to Hezekiah His gracious purpose of deliverance, saying: "I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears, behold I will heal thee." So Elihu mentions, as a glorious possibility, a Messenger, a Divine Interpreter, to declare to man: "Deliver him from going down to the pit; I have found a ransom." In what way more fitting, more touching, more expressive could that inspired אִם־יֵשׁ, that glorious hypothesis of an incomparable Divine Messenger and Interpreter have been revealed to an Old Testament saint than through such an experience as that of Hezekiah's, when the prophet-evangelist, whom he knew and loved so well, brought him that message of life in death? Who better qualified to be the human type of the Divine Malâk and Melîtz than Isaiah? Who so well fitted to receive, to understand, and to convey to others that prophetic glimpse of the Prophet that was to come as Hezekiah?

13. The wonderful restoration of Hezekiah and the lengthening of His life, finds its exact counterpart in the language of Elihu and Job, and in the fact recorded in the Epilogue (chap. xlii. 16). How wonderfully lifelike the language of Elihu in chap. xxxiii. 25 if viewed as prompted by just such an experience as that of Hezekiah! "His flesh revives with the freshness of youth; he shall return to the days of his youth." What more truthful than the joy which such a restoration of the healthy flesh would bring to one afflicted as either Job or Hezekiah was! What new force and vividness are imparted to the yearning presage of the doctrine of the resurrection in chap. xix. 25 seq., when interpreted in the light of an event which to him who realized it was all but a resurrection from the dead! So also the addition of one hundred and forty years to Job's life would have for such an one a real, vital significance, as a token of God's favor, which it could never possess as a mere fiction of the imagination. As Delitzsch says: "After that Job has learned from his own experience that God brings to Hades and out again, he has forever conquered all fear of death, and the germs of a hope of a future life, which in the midst of his affliction have broken through his

consciousness, can joyously expand. *For Job appears to himself as one who is risen from the dead, and is a pledge to himself of the resurrection from the dead*" (Commy. I, p. 315). Of what known historical character could this be more truly said than of Hezekiah?

14. The intimations which are given us respecting Hezekiah's personal character, views, and conduct, are hardly less significant. He is thus described in 2 Kings xviii. 3 seq.: "He did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, according to all that David his father did. . . . He trusted in the Lord God of Israel; so that after him was none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him. For he clave to the Lord, and departed not from following him, but kept his commandments, which the Lord commanded Moses. And the Lord was with him, and he prospered whithersoever he went forth," *etc.* There is much in this description to remind us of Job's pre-eminent piety and prosperity, as described in the Prologue. Hezekiah describes himself as "having walked before Jehovah with a perfect heart, and having done that which was good in His sight," and in his prayer he beseeches Jehovah to remember this (Isa. xxxviii. 3). So Job is described as perfect and upright, one that feared God, eschewed evil; he pleads his integrity (chap. vi. 10; x. 7; xiii. 16; xvi. 17; xix. 23 seq.; xxiii. 29, 31, *passim*), and prays that God would reward him according thereto. So Elihu says of God: "He will render unto man his righteousness." All this is precisely in the spirit of Hezekiah's prayer, and like that prayer all bears the stamp of a living experience. To Hezekiah as to Job his affliction was a mystery, unexpected and inexplicable. The Jewish tradition heightens the mystery by representing him as previously believing in his own immortality. This of course is to be rejected, and yet it is of historic value as a witness to the contrast between Hezekiah's previous career of unclouded prosperity and happiness, and the gloom with which his sickness beclouded his destiny. Just such a contrast in kind as that between Job's prosperity and adversity. The greatest and best of kings since David, who had done more than all his predecessors to restore the purity of faith and worship in the land, the immediate successor, too, of Ahaz, one of the most wicked of the kings, and yet a grievous sufferer, and cut off in the midst of his days! Would it be at all strange if such a mind, richly endowed with the poetic faculty, tried with such dark and bitter experiences, and grappling with the problems which such experiences suggested, should have felt himself drawn to the story of Job, and incited to do just what the author of this book has done, in using it as a poetic medium by which to communicate the results of his thoughts and experiences to the world?

15. We have other intimations of severe mental conflict in the experience of Hezekiah. Thus when the Assyrian Rabshakeh had delivered his insulting message from Sennacherib, Hezekiah "rent his clothes, and covered himself with sackcloth, and went into the house of the Lord" (2 Kings xix. 1 seq.). And indeed the history of his relations to the king of Assyria down to the overthrow of Sennacherib's hosts must have been productive throughout of continual anxiety, conflict, at times even agony of soul (see 1 Kings xix. 14 seq.). And in the case of so thoughtful and devout a prince as Hezekiah, these conflicts through which he passed were not the mental exercises of one occupied simply with questions of statecraft, or secular business; they involved the application of moral and religious principles of the most profound and comprehensive significance. This may be assumed with certainty from the character of the man, from the circumstances of his reign, and from the peculiar relations and sympathy between himself and the prophet Isaiah (see below No. 20). There are few characters throughout the history of the Hebrew theocracy, the thrilling experiences of whose life would furnish so many of the psychological antecedents to the production of this great religious drama as Hezekiah.

16. The conspicuous position which Hezekiah occupies as a moral reformer of the Jewish people is highly significant. One of the first acts of his reign was to re-open the temple, to re-establish, purify, and enrich its service and ceremonial (2 Chron. xxix.). He showed the thoroughness of his reformatory spirit by removing the "high places" of all kinds, not only those on which false gods were worshipped, but those as well which some even of his pious predecessors had spared for the worship of Jehovah (2 Kings xviii. 4, 22). "The measure must have caused a very violent shock to the religious prejudices of a large number of

people, and we have a curious and almost unnoticed trace of this resentment in the fact that Rabshakeh appeals to the discontented faction, and represents Hezekiah as a dangerous innovator, who had provoked God's anger by his arbitrary impiety" (Smith's *Bib. Dic.*, Art. "High Places"). He showed his courage by destroying the Nehushtan, revered and at times worshipped by the nation, as the serpent lifted up by Moses in the wilderness (2 Kings xviii. 4). "To break up a figure so curious and so highly honored showed a strong mind, as well as a clear-sighted zeal" (Smith's *Bib. Dic.*, Art. "Hezekiah"). "He was, so to speak, the first Reformer; the first of the Jewish Church to protest against institutions which had outlived their usefulness, and which the nation had outgrown" (Stanley: *Hist. of the Jewish Church*, Lect. 38). After the fall of the kingdom of Israel Hezekiah sought to restore the spiritual unity of the nation by inviting the remnant of Ephraim and Manasseh to unite in celebrating a grand national Passover in Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxx.). Herein we see the same characteristic traits, the same fearlessness, independence, contempt of false forms (shown perhaps in contemptuously characterizing the "Sacred Serpent," *Nehushtan*,* the brazen thing), the same spirituality, breadth, freedom, which we find in the book of Job, in its protests against popular traditional errors, in its assertion of profound spiritual truth. That combination of reverent faith with iconoclastic daring, of theocratic devoutness with cosmopolitan breadth, of the love even of ceremonial reality with the hatred even of theological shams, which is so marked a characteristic of the book of Job, is just what we find in Hezekiah, above almost all the leading characters of Old Testament history.

17. The general literary culture of Hezekiah may be inferred not only from his Ode, but also from his establishment of a College of Sages, and the commission which he gave them to collect and preserve the Solomonic literature (Prov. xxv. 1). The interest in the Chokmah literature which this fact discloses is in perfect keeping with the hypothesis that one of the brightest ornaments of that literature should have proceeded from him.

18. In closest connection with this Hezekianic supplement to the Proverbs, if not indeed as a part of it, we have another incidental, but striking confirmation of the hypothesis here continued. The proverbs of Agur and Lemuel (Prov. xxx. 31), there are valid reasons for believing, are of extra-Palestinian origin (see Commy. on Proverbs in this Series, Vol. X. pp. 30, 246 seq., 256 seq.; also Stuart on Proverbs, p. 47 seq.). Without arguing the controverted questions pertaining to the subject, it is sufficient for our present purpose to note the fact that in all probability these fragments originated in Massa, a district of Northern Arabia, their authors, Agur and Lemuel, who were possibly brothers, being princes of the kingdom. If (according to Delitzsch) the district was Ishmaelitish, the interest shown in their writings by Hezekiah and his college would be precisely what we should expect on the theory of the Hezekianic origin of Job. Nothing certainly could be more natural than that the interest shown in the pious and wise meditations of the two extra-theocratic Arabian Emirs, Agur and Lemuel (with their noble mother), should accompany the interest shown in the story, and the religious meditations suggested by the story of the extra-theocratic north-Arabian emir, Job. If (according to Hitzig, Stuart, *etc.*) Massa was an Israelitish colony in Arabia, we are brought at once to the migration of the Simeonites to Mt. Seir, recorded in 1 Chron. iv. 38–43 as having taken place in the days of Hezekiah. If we assign that migration to the earlier part of Hezekiah's long reign (of 29 years) the supposition becomes not at all impossible nor improbable that the words of Agur and Lemuel should have been brought to the knowledge of Hezekiah and his sages before the close of his reign.

19. And here we are brought to consider the remarkable correspondences between the words of Agur and the book of Job. If in Prov. xxx. 1 we read לָאִיתִי אֵל, "I have labored, wearied myself about God," we have the thought, of which Job is so full, that the utmost of human power and exertion will never fathom the mystery of God's Being. Compare still further ver. 3 with Job xviii. 3; ver. 4 with Job xi. 8; xxii. 12, 14; xxvi. 14; xxxviii. 5, 6, 10, 11, 21; xii. 24; ver. 9 with Job xxi. 14; xxxi. 24, 25, 28; ver. 32 with Job xxi. 5; xl. 4. Also the mythological Aluka in ver. 15, (respecting which see below, No. 23). These corres-

* So Dean Stanley: "The Sacred Serpent, the symbol of the Divine Presence, had been treated contemptuously as a mere serpent, a mere piece of brass, and nothing more."

pondences, especially those from the introductory fragment of Agur's words (vers. 1–6), are certainly remarkable enough to justify the inference that the one writer was familiar with the other. The imperfect, fragmentary, obscure character of Agur's words would indicate that they were the original. If so, who more likely to have known of them and used them (at least on the hypothesis given above) than Hezekiah?

20. The correspondences between Job and Isaiah are most numerous and striking, as the following table will show. In the first class, marked A, we have correspondences of thought, and in many instances of the accompanying expression; in the second class, marked B, the correspondences are simply of expression.

A

Job i. 6 seq.	with	Isa. vi. 1 seq.	Job xii. 9	with	Isa. xli. 20
iii. 23	"	xl. 27	xii. 9	"	lxvi. 2
iv. 3	"	xxxv. 3	xii. 13	"	xi. 2
iv. 19	"	l. 9	xii. 17	"	xx. 4
iv. 19	"	li. 8	xii. 17	"	xliv. 25
iv. 21	"	xxxiii. 20	xii. 17	"	xix. 11 seq.
v. 3	"	xxvii. 6	xii. 19	"	xl. 23
v. 14	"	xix. 13 seq.	xii. 22	"	xxix. 15
v. 14	"	lix. 10	xii. 24	"	xix. 13
viii. 14	"	lix. 5	xii. 25	"	xix. 14
ix. 6	"	xiii. 13	xiii. 19	"	l. 9
ix. 8	"	xl. 22	xiv. 2	"	xi. 7
ix. 8	"	xliv. 24	xiv. 7	"	vi. 13
ix. 9	"	xiii. 10	xiv. 7	"	xl. 24
x. 9	"	xxix. 16	xiv. 11	"	xix. 5
x. 16	"	xxxi. 4	xiv. 12	"	li. 6
xi. 13	"	i. 15			
xi. 14	"	i. 15	xv. 33	"	xviii. 5
xi. 19	"	xvii. 2	xv. 35	"	xxxiii. 11
xvi. 10	"	lvii. 4	xxvi. 13	"	li. 9
xvi. 18	"	xxvi. 21	xxvii. 21	"	xxvii. 8
xvii. 12	"	v. 20	xxviii. 25	"	xl. 12
xviii. 13	"	ix. 20	xxix. 14	"	xi. 5
xviii. 14	"	xxviii. 15	xxix. 14	"	li. 9
xviii. 15	"	xiii. 19	xxix. 14	"	lix. 17
xviii. 15	"	xxxiv. 11	xxix. 14	"	lxi. 10
xviii. 16	"	v. 24	xxx. 21	"	lxiii. 10
xviii. 19	"	xiv. 22	xxx. 26	"	lix. 9
xviii. 20	"	xiii. 8	xxx. 27	"	xvi. 11
xx. 6	"	xiv. 13 seq.	xxx. 30	"	xxiv. 6
xx. 8	"	xxix. 7	xxxi. 36 seq.	"	lxi. 10
xx. 26	"	xxx. 11 seq.	xxxvi. 16	"	xxv. 6
xxi. 12	"	v. 12	xxxvi. 16	"	lv. 2
xxi. 18	"	xvii. 13	xxxviii. 7	"	xiv. 12
xxi. 24	"	lviii. 11	xxxviii. 23	"	xxviii. 17
xxii. 14	"	xxix. 15	xl. 11	"	ii. 12 seq.
xxii. 24	"	xiii. 12			
xxii. 26	"	lviii. 14			
xxvi. 7	"	xl. 22			
xxvi. 7	"	xliv. 24			
xxvi. 11	"	l. 2			
xxvi. 12	"	li. 15			

B

Job iii. 7	with	Isa. xlix. 21	Job. xii. 21	with	Isa. v. 27
iii. 13	"	xxiii. 12	xiii. 17	"	vi. 9
iii. 14	"	lviii. 12	xiii. 26	"	x. 1
iii. 14	"	lxi. 4	xiv. 5	"	x. 22
iii. 17	"	xiii. 11	xv. 11	"	vii. 13
iii. 17	"	xxv. 3	xv. 13	"	xxv. 4
iv. 5	"	xvi. 8	xv. 32	"	ix. 13
v. 20	"	xlvii. 14	xv. 32	"	xix. 15
v. 21	"	xxviii. 15	xvi. 4	"	xxxvii. 22
vi. 10	"	xxx. 14	xviii. 4	"	vii. 16
vii. 1	"	xl. 2	xviii. 4	"	vi. 12
vii. 2	"	xl. 10	xxii. 11	"	lx. 6
vii. 19	"	xxii. 4	xxii. 23	"	xix. 22
viii. 11	"	xviii. 2	xxii. 28	"	vii. 7
viii. 11	"	xxxv. 7	xxiii. 11	"	xxx. 11
viii. 11	"	xix. 7	xxvi. 13	"	xxvii. 1
viii. 20	"	xli. 13	xxxvi. 3	"	xxxvii. 26
viii. 20	"	xlii. 6			
ix. 7	"	xix. 18			
ix. 13	"	li. 9			
ix. 13	"	xxx. 7			
ix. 13	"	xxvii. 1			
x. 4	"	xxxi. 3			
xi. 4	"	xxix. 24			

It is not claimed of course that all the individual instances here given imply derivation on the part of either from the other. The large number of similarities does, however, unquestionably prove that either Isaiah was largely influenced by the author of Job, or conversely. It is certainly not impossible that Isaiah was indebted to Job for the above analogies, or most of them. On the other hand it is equally possible, and in some instances more probable from the nature of the resemblance, that Isaiah was the original. In view of the intimate personal relations between Isaiah and Hezekiah, the strong influence, mental and moral, which the aged prophet exerted over the youthful king, the marked impression which the words of the former made on the latter, nothing could be more natural or probable than that if Hezekiah was the author of Job, the influence of Isaiah should be visible throughout.

21. A few striking coincidences with the prophet Amos have been noted, to wit:

Job ix. 8	with	Amos iv. 13	Job xxviii. 14	with	Amos ix. 2, 3
ix. 9	"	v. 8	xxviii. 25, 26	"	ix. 6
x. 22	"	v. 8	xxxviii. 25	"	ix. 6
xx. 6 seq.		ix. 2, 3	xxxviii. 31	"	v. 8

Zöckler, Delitzsch and others infer from these the priority of Job. The converse, however, may just as reasonably be maintained. There is no reason why Hezekiah, for instance, should not have been familiar with his prophecies, especially when we remember the deep interest which he took in the spiritual reformation of the entire nation.

22. The manifold correspondences between this book and the Proverbs need only be referred to. It should be noted, however, that some of the most striking of these correspondences relate to the first nine chapters of the book, which Delitzsch, Zöckler and others place considerably later than Solomon. Moreover, they are of such a character as to indicate the priority of the passages in the Proverbs. This is notably the case with Job xv. 7 seq., which is evidently an ironical application to Job of the description of Wisdom in Prov. viii. 22 seq. (ver. 25 in particular). The whole bitter force of the questions of Eliphaz here comes from

his tacit assumption that Job is not only familiar with the language of Wisdom, but that by his self-conceit he arrogates to himself the prerogatives which Wisdom there claims. The suggestion of our Commy. (see on ch. xv. 7) that the passage in Proverbs was derived from that in Job is a most palpable ὕστερον πρότερον. Comp. a similar ironical use of Ps. viii. 4 in Job vii. 17, and see the Commy. on the latter passage.

23. The poetic use of mythological representions of foreign origin, which is so marked a peculiarity of the book of Job (see Commy. on ch. iii. 8; ix. 13; xxvi. 12, 13; xxviii. 18; xxxviii. 31, 32), find their closest analogies in the literature of the Hezekianic period; to wit in Isaiah (see ch. xiv. 13; xxvii. 1), and in Agur (Prov. xxx. 15). This seems to have been the period when the Hebrew mind was most susceptible to the intellectual as to the other influences of the oriental populations by which it was surrounded, and when the facilities for such influence were most abundant. "All the kingdoms from the Tigris to the Nile," says Ewald (*Gesch. Des Volkes Israel*, p. 647), were united together in the most manifold and close ties; and between Israel and these people (Israel's civil power being now largely broken) an ever more active rivalry sprang up in the pursuit of wisdom." That the mind of Hezekiah was keenly alive to these influences is evident from the wide range of his political relations, and material acquisitions. That with all his theocratic devoutness he would not as a poet reject such poetic mythological ornamentation may be inferred from the fact that as a king "even in the changes which he introduced into the Temple, he spared all the astrological altars and foreign curiosities which Ahaz had erected" (Stanley: *Hist. of the Jew. Ch.*, Lect. XXXVIII.; see 2 Kings xxiii. 12).

24. This suggests that the protest against astral worship found in Job xxxi. 26 seq. would have all the more force if proceeding from Hezekiah, when we consider that during the reign of Ahaz his father, it is said of the nation that they "worshipped all the host of heaven" (2 Kings xvii. 16), and that it was one chief object of Hezekiah to purify the nation of this sin (2 Kings xviii. 4; 2 Chron. xxxi. 1).

25. While it is true, as Zöckler argues, that the passages which describe the rise and power of the wicked and the oppressor, and the invasions of alien powers (see ch. ix. 24; xii. 4–6, 14–25; xv. 18 seq., 28; xvii. 8, 9; xxi. 7 seq., 16–18; xxiv. 2–17) are not decisive as to the age of an Oriental poem, it may fairly be urged that the frequency of such passages, and the feeling which manifestly pervades the descriptions, would seem to show that it was an evil of peculiar magnitude and oppressiveness in the time of the author of Job. Such we know was the character of the Assyrian tyranny and invasions of Oriental lands, and particularly of Palestine in the age of Hezekiah. See 2 Kings xviii. 9, 13, 17; xix. 8, 17, 24, *etc.*

26. The Assyrian invasion of the kingdom of Israel under Shalmaneser, and the deportation of the ten tribes, which took place in the time of Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 9 12) was an event which could not fail of making a profound impression on the heart and imagination of Hezekiah, and of reflecting itself in his writings. Do not such passages as Job xii. 14-25; xv. 19–30, breathe the very sentiments and language which the invasion, overthrow and captivity of the neighboring kingdom would evoke?

27. The most remarkable historical event in the reign of Hezekiah, and one of the most remarkable recorded in history, was the invasion of Sennacherib, and the overthrow of his hosts in one night by "the Angel of the Lord." And is not the book of Job full of that tragic event, and its solemn lessons? See ch. xxxiv. 20 ("*In a moment* shall they die, and the *people* shall be troubled *at midnight, and pass away;* and the mighty shall be taken away *without hand*"), 24 ("He shall *break in pieces mighty men without number*," *etc.*), 25 ("He overturneth them in the night," *etc.*); xxxv. 10; xxxvi 20; ("Desire not the night, when people are cut off in their place," or on the spot); xl. 12, 13. Are not these descriptions and warnings manifestly inspired by the destruction of Sennacherib's army? Comp. Ps. lxxvi. 5, 6, a Psalm which some critics have, not without reason, ascribed to Hezekiah.

28. Shortly before the time of Hezekiah, in the reign of Uzziah, an appalling earthquake took place in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. It was an event so notable as to become a historical landmark (see Amos i. 1). According to Zechariah (xiv. 4, 5), compared with Josephus, *Ant.* IX. 10, § 4, it would seem to have split the Mount of Olives, or some other

hill near the city, and to have overturned a part of it (see Smith's *Bib. Dic*, Art. "Earthquake"). Would not this catastrophe account for the many and vivid references in Job to such convulsions of nature? See ch. ix. 5, 6; xiv. 18; xviii. 4; xxvi. 11.

29. The frequency and elaborate fulness of the references to kings, rulers, judges, in the book, are suggestive of a profound interest on the part of the writer in that class of persons, their conduct and their destiny. See ch. iii. 14, 15; ix. 24; xii. 17–19; xv. 24; xxi. 28-33; xxix. 7 seq., 25; xxxi. 37; xxxiv. 18 seq.; xxxvi. 7. The same may be said of the passages which describe the movements and destinies of nations, *e g.* ch. xii. 23–25; xxxiv. 29, 30; those which describe the administration of justice, especially ch. xxix. 12 seq.; the many military terms and allusions, *e. g.* ch. x. 17; xv. 24; xix. 12; xx. 24; xxx. 12 seq.; xxxviii. 23, including also the description of the war horse in ch. xxxix. The *con amore* tone of these passages must be perceptible at a glance. The author, if not a king, statesman, warrior, like Hezekiah, at least thought, and felt, and wrote like one.

30. The Egyptian peculiarities of the book, which have led Hirzel, Hitzig and others to suppose that it must have been written in Egypt (*e. g.* the references to the Nile, ch. vii. 12; viii. 11-13; ix. 26; to pyramids, ch. iii. 14; the descriptions of the hippopotamus and the crocodile in chs. xl., xli.), will not be found strange if we ascribe the book to Hezekiah, when we remember the intimate relations existing during his reign between the kingdoms of Judah and Egypt (see 2 Kings xviii. 21, 24, and comp. the denunciations of the Egyptian alliance by Isaiah in Isa. xxx. 2-6; xxxi. 1, and elsewhere).

31. The prevalence of Aramaic peculiarities in the book of Job, introduced as a feature in the artistic local coloring of the discourses, need not surprise us in an age when the "Syrian language" was so well understood by Hezekiah's courtiers, as appears to have been the case from Isa. xxxvi. 11, and when Aramaic influences in general were making themselves felt more and more in Palestine.

32. The interest which the book of Job shows in mining operations (see especially chap. xxviii.) was peculiarly characteristic of the age of Hezekiah. See Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, p. 645. We have an example of this in the account given of Sargon's expedition to Palestine during the 14th year of the reign of Hezekiah (referred to in Isa. xx.), when, according to Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geogr.*, he occupied himself in the inspection of mines, (see Smith's *Bib. Dic.*, Art. "Hezekiah"). To this may be added the skill shown by Hezekiah in the engineering operations by which Jerusalem was put in a state of defense against the army of Sennacherib (2 Chron. xxxii. 2-5). That a poet possessed of so high an order of mechanical genius as Hezekiah should have written the 28th chapter of Job is at least a very reasonable supposition.

33. This is still further confirmed by what is said of Hezekiah's wealth and treasures in 2 Kings xx. 13; 2 Chron. xxxii. 27 seq. "The palace at Jerusalem," says Stanley, "was a storehouse of gold, silver, and jewels; the porch of the palace was once more hung with splendid shields." The abundant mention of precious stones by the author of Job, and his elaborate description of the operations and products of mining, are, to say the least, not inconsistent with what is said of Hezekiah.

34. Observe moreover that in the description of Hezekiah's possessions, special mention is made (2 Chron. xxxii. 28) of his "stalls *for all manner of beasts*," showing that, like his illustrious predecessor, Solomon (1 Kings iv. 33), whom he resembled in so many particulars, he was particularly interested in the study of natural history. Would not this account for the elaborate, accurate, and animated descriptions which the author of Job has given of various animals in chaps. xxxviii.—xli.?

35. Although the discussion of ethical problems is characteristic of the literature which sprang up in the time of David and Solomon in general. the discussion of questions connected with the providential administration of human affairs, and particularly of that which is mysterious in the Divine Dispensations, belongs to the later, rather than the earlier portions of this literature. This appears from an examination of Ezek. xiv. 18; Jer. xxxi. 29 seq. Compare with these passages, *e. g.*, Job xxi. 19 seq.

36. The theological significance of the book of Job becomes much more intelligible if

referred to the age of Hezekiah, and particularly to the period intervening between the earlier and the later prophecies of Isaiah. (Note the place of the Hezekiah episode in the book of Isaiah). Its portraiture of suffering innocence, together with its intimations of a *Deus apud Deum*, to whom Job appeals, of a Mokiach, a Goēl, a Melîtz,* from whom mercy and deliverance may be expected, are a most admirable preparation for the Messiah of Isaiah. Its doctrine of the Chokmah, if not an advance upon that of the book of Proverbs, is its harmonious practical complement. Its intimations of immortality in chapters xiv. and xix. are the fitting, and even the necessary prelude of the more full and complete revelations of Ezekiel and Daniel. Its glimpse of a vindication over the dust of Job furnishes the indispensable transition from the simple immortality of the older, to the more definite resurrection-dogma of the later Old Testament revelation.

37. The Princeton Review (Vol. 39, p. 325) truly remarks: "That the author of such a book as this should have wholly dropped from sight, and have made no figure with his transcendent abilities in the history of Israel, seems scarcely supposable." If the hint here given be entertained, we are not reduced to such a conclusion. Is it altogether unreasonable, in view of the cumulative weight of the considerations presented above, to link to this transcendent book, the name of that extraordinary prince whom the Rabbinical literature has even identified with the Messiah? E].

§ 8. THE UNITY AND INTEGRITY OF THE POEM VINDICATED.

a. Against the modern assaults on the genuineness of the prologue and epilogue.

The less there is to be said of discussions concerning the authenticity of the poem, in view of its anonymousness, and the absence of all traditional conjectures even in respect to the author, the more zealously has modern criticism directed its efforts against *the integrity* of our book, and attempted to discredit portions of it, larger or smaller, as interpolations. Only the exegesis indeed can show, by examination in detail, that these assaults vary in their critical value, proceeding as they do sometimes from better, sometimes from inferior motives, at the same time that they must all alike come to grief when tested by a right conception of the idea and development of the poem. The present introduction however must furnish a summary of the most important arguments on the opposite side, together with a preliminary refutation of the same.

The genuineness of the prologue and the epilogue (chap. I., II., and chap. XLII. 7-17) was controverted by R. Simon (*Hist. crit.*), and A. Schultens (*Commentar. in Job*, Lugd Bat. 1737). They have been followed by Hasse in his *Magazin für die biblische orientalische Literatur* (I. 162 seq.), Stuhlmann, Bernstein, D. v. Cölln (*Bibl. Theologie des Alten Testaments*, p. 295), Magnus and Knobel (*De carminis Jobi argumento, fine, ac dispositione*, 1835; also *Studd. u. Kritt*, 1842, II). The doubt of these writers in respect to the genuineness of these sections has in general for its basis the assumption, that *the poetic kernel of the book could not have been framed around with an introduction and a conclusion in prose.* Delitzsch however rightly maintains in opposition to this opinion that without such a historical introduction and close the middle part of the book would be "a torso without head or foot." Moreover the narrative in both these sections, although without rhythmic form, nevertheless exhibits an essentially poetic character (witness the ideal symmetry of the enumerations in chap. i. 2, 3, and in chap. xlii. 12, 13; the freedom and freshness and loftiness of the language in describing the celestial assembly in chap. i. 6 seq.; ii. 1 seq.; the genuinely epic uniformity of the form of expression used in introducing the four calamities, chap. i. 14, 16, 17, 18; the transition in Job's utterances to the strict and obvious parallelism of poetry, chap. i. 21, *etc.*). On the contrary the poetic kernel of the book is interspersed with a number of prose elements, to wit, the superscriptions of the various poetic discourses, not one of which is constructed with the parallel rhythm, which otherwise prevails here throughout.

In addition to this principal argument the following considerations have led the above-mentioned critics to doubt the genuineness of the prologue and epilogue:

* It is at least a little curious that except in Gen. xlii. 23, the word מֵלִיץ is found only in Job, in Isaiah once (xliii. 27), and in 2 Chron. xxxii. 31 of the envoys of the king of Babylon to Hezekiah.

(1) An assumed *contradiction between these two parts of the idea of the poem.* While the latter contemplates Job's sufferings from a point of view which is far more profound and ethically pure, the author of the prologue and epilogue, as the last-named section in particular shows, favors the ordinary Mosaic doctrine of retribution, and so represents the accusations uttered against God by the sorely afflicted Job, as being in some measure justified, while his repentance and confession (chap. xlii. 1-6) are in the same measure superfluous. It is however sufficiently evident that the prologue sets forth Job's suffering as absolutely dark and mysterious, at the same time that this section is written with a view to the gradual unfolding of the profounder significance of these sufferings. Nay this later unraveling of that which at first view is represented as incomprehensible would without that introduction float in the air with nothing to support it Without the firm historical basis of the prologue the whole poem would remain unintelligible and give occasion for the vaguest conjectures touching the question whether in truth an innocent sufferer is to be described or not. And as furnishing valid and complete proof that in this case the divinely ordained suffering had in fact overtaken one who was (comparatively speaking) innocent, but whom his friends had unjustly and rashly charged with grievous offences, the deliverance and restoration of the sufferer as it actually took place, and as related in the epilogue, was no less indispensable. The mere oral vindication of the sentence pronounced by Jehovah, without the subsequent reinstatement of Job in his former prosperity, would have left the matter in a decidedly unsatisfactory state. It would have been intelligible only from the New Testament point of view, and for Christian readers, who after sore afflictions and trials in this life have learned to hope for the crown of righteousness in the other life through the merits of Christ,—not for Old Testament saints, who had not yet enjoyed the privilege of being "born again to a lively hope" through the death and resurrection of Jesus, and who consequently might and must look for a complete retribution in this life, comp. the Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks on chap. xlii. 7-17.

(2) The alleged *contradiction between Job's calm, meek resignation to God's will,* as described in the prologue (chap. i. 21; ii. 10 seq.), *and his passionate excited utterances* in chap. iii. 1 seq., and also his subsequent bitter accusations against God and his friends. An objection which is closely dependent on the preceding, and which has already been refuted for the most part by the reply made to that. It is necessary to note the difference in time between the conduct of Job, *when as yet he was a silent sufferer,* and seemed therefore to be altogether innocent and sinless, and the subsequent outbreak of his real moral nature, which came to pass as the result of his conflict with his friends, and which showed that his nature had not been fully purified, or raised above the necessity of repentance and atonement.

(3) A contradiction is claimed between chap. i. 18, 19, *where Job's children perish,* and passages like chap. xix. 17; xiv. 21; xxxi 8, where he seems *to possess children in the midst of his misery.* The passage in chap. xix. 17 is however the only one which really presupposes that there was any offspring to Job during the colloquy with his friends; and there by the בְּנֵי בִטְנִי are to be understood either Job's natural brothers ("sons of the same womb"), or, as is more probable and more in harmony with the usage of language, grandchildren, or other natural descendants of Job (*e. g.* children begotten of concubines), who were not included in the destruction of his sons and daughters recorded in the prologue. For in chap. viii. 4; xxix. 5 this destruction of his children in the more strict and proper sense is clearly enough presupposed as having been actually accomplished, a fact which proves at the same time how absurd, or at least how superfluous it is to assume that in that passage in chap. xix. the poet could for the moment have forgotten himself. Comp. the exposition of the several passages under consideration.

(4) A further incongruity is claimed to lie in *the high value which the prologue and epilogue ascribe to sacrifices* (chap. i. 5; xlii. 8), while the kernel of the poem knows nothing either of this, or of any other theocratic ceremonial. As though the propitiation of the Deity by sacrifices were a theocratic peculiarity! As though even in the time of the patriarchs sacrificial observances of the most various sorts did not exist, and in particular those in which the number seven was an important feature (comp. above, Nos. 5 and 6)! And as

though the absence of any mention of sacrifices in the poetic part of the book were not purely accidental!

(5) *The use of the divine name "Jehovah"* in the prologue and epilogue contradicts, it is claimed, the almost entire absence of this name from the poetic part, where God is called only Eloah, Shaddai, *etc.* But the name Jehovah is by no means entirely wanting in the poetic portions. It occurs in Job's mouth in two passages, being used in chap. xii. 9 and xxviii. 28 (comp. § 5), and is besides introduced by the poet in the closing chapters containing the discourse of God Himself, no less than five times (chap. xxxviii. 1; xl. 1, 3, 6; xlii. 1). The predominance of those other names of God in the poetic part, and especially in the discourses of the friends and of Elihu, is beyond question directly due to the poetic purpose of the author, who aims to preserve so far as possible the patriarchal, pre-Mosaic coloring of the entire drama, and for that reason retires during the discussion that name of God which was specifically characteristic of the theocracy. The theory that the reason for this peculiar apportionment of the divine names lies in the predominantly poetic significance of the names Eloah and Shaddai (Bertholdt, Gesenius, Gleiss, de Wette, *etc.*), or in the purely external purpose of the poet to distinguish himself from the persons introduced as speaking (Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, p. 198), is far less probable than the motive here assigned, which is essentially the view also adopted by Michaelis, Steudel, Stickel, Ewald, Delitzsch, *etc.**

(6) Finally it is claimed that *the peculiar role assigned to Satan in the prologue* bears witness against the genuineness of this section, and proves that it was added by a later hand; an argument on which particular stress is laid by Knobel (*l. c.*), and of which mention has already been made in § 6, in opposition to the attempts made to prove that the book was written during or after the period of the exile. It was there maintained, and it will be more fully demonstrated below in the exegesis of the passage that the assumption of a Chaldee or Persian origin for the idea of Satan, has no historical reality. Here we may first of all refer to the fact that the knowledge of a Satan, or of a personal evil principle, is unquestionably of pre-Mosaic origin, as the Serpent in Paradise, and the Azazel of the levitical ceremonial legislation clearly enough prove, and that no valid objection can be urged against the use of the name שָׂטָן to designate this evil archangel at so early a period as that when our poem is conjectured to have originated. This especially in view of the appellative use of the word in such passages as Num. xxii. 22 and Ps. cix. 6, and in view of the notorious scarcity of poetic books, of the class to which ours belongs, which only during the long interval between the Solomonic epoch and the origin of post-exilic books like Zechariah and the Chronicles could have given real occasion for using the name Satan (comp. 1 Kings xxii. 19 seq., where the evil spirit is designated simply הָרוּחַ, with Zech. iii. 1 and 1 Chron. xxi. 1 seq.).

From all this it is clear that there are no valid reasons whatever for denying the genuineness of the prologue and epilogue; and that furthermore the attempts of Bernstein and Heiligstedt to distinguish between a genuine nucleus for the prologue and later interpolations (*e. g.* according to Heiligstedt's conjecture, ch. i. 6–12 and ii. 1–7), are unnecessary. Prologue and epilogue, as they actually lie before us, are indispensable to the complete unfolding of the idea of the poem. Without them the whole would be an inexplicable enigma.†

* It is a mistaken and misleading view that is taken by Hengstenberg (*Beiträge* II., 302 seq.), when he explains the poet's motive for using the name Jehovah in the Prologue, and the other names of God in the poem itself, to be his purpose "to present the solution of his problem not from the standpoint of revelation, but from that of natural theology." Against which Hahn rightly remarks (p. 12), that, on the contrary, the discourse of God is introduced for the very purpose of showing that natural human wisdom cannot decide the controversy. The reason which he himself assigns for this contrasted use of the various names of God, is not altogether a suitable one; to wit, that in the prologue and epilogue God bears the name Jehovah as the *manifested* God, who even in the apparently mysterious afflictions of His people nevertheless deals graciously and lovingly, whereas on the contrary in the poem itself He appears as the *concealed* God, who in His mysterious ways confronts man as a stranger, and in His omnipotence as highly exalted above the world, and who accordingly is called Elohim, Eloah, or Shaddai. The poet himself scarcely makes so artificial a distinction.

† Comp. Keil, Introduction, I. 494 seq., as well as the following remark of Rosenmüller, there cited (*Schol.* p. 46): You have a work incomplete in every part, a mere collection of speeches, of whose cause, subject and object you are ignorant, if you take away the exordium and conclusion.

§ 9. CONTINUATION. THE INTEGRITY OF THE POEM VINDICATED.

b. Against the modern assaults on the sections: ch. xxvii. 7—*xxviii.* 28, *and ch. xl.* 15—*xli.* 26.

Within the poetic kernel of the poem *the section concerning Wisdom*, ch. xxviii., and also *the description of the behemoth and leviathan* (chs. xl. and xli.) have become chief objects of assault from the destructive criticism.

I. The *passage concerning Wisdom*, ch. xxviii., together with the larger half of the preceding chapter (ch. xxvii. 13-23), although its genuineness was not disputed, was regarded as having been improperly attributed to Job by some of the earlier critics, as *e. g.* Kennicott (*Remarks on Select Passages in the Old Testament*, p. 169), Eichhorn (*Allg. Bibl. der bibl. Literatur*, II. 613), Bertholdt and Stuhlmann (the latter including also vers. 11-12 of ch. xxvii.). They ascribed ch. xxvii. 13 seq. (or ch. xxvii. 11 seq.) to Zophar, and ch. xxviii. to Bildad [Bernard and Elzas, however, include ch. xxviii. in the speech of Zophar, while Wemyss destroys the artistic plan of the book entirely by transferring it to the end as the "peroration" of the whole]. Bernstein, advancing still further in the path on which these writers had entered, denied the genuineness of the entire section from ch. xxvii. 7 on, and Knobel sought to prove that ch. xxviii. at least was a later interpolation. The reasons for these critical decisions were the alleged contradictions and inconsistencies (on which De Wette also had animadverted, *Einl.* § 288), which would lie in the sections under consideration, inasmuch as ch. xxvii. 7 seq. (or 11 seq.) teaches the ordinary doctrine of retribution, against which Job has previously declared most solemnly and decisively, and inasmuch as the reference to the hidden wisdom of God in ch. xxviii., summoning as it does to humility, does not agree with the exhibitions of a presumptuous confidence and proud self-consciousness, which appear in Job's previous discourses. But that which Job seems to say in ch. xxvii. in favor of the common external theory of retribution, is in reality intended only to supplement and to rectify that which he had previously maintained, in a manner somewhat one-sided and liabled to be misunderstood, concerning the earthly prosperity of the wicked. The truth, on which thus far exclusive emphasis had been laid, that oftentimes there is no just distribution in the apportionment of men's lots, he now supplements with the truth, which indeed he also states partially, and without the proper exceptions and qualifications, that *at last* the wicked always receive their merited reward [see Exegetical Remarks on ch. xxvii. 9, 10]. And in order to make it apparent, that along with this latter truth he still adhered to that which he had formerly maintained respecting the prosperity of the wicked and the sufferings of the righteous, he immediately proceeds in ch. xxviii. to describe the mysteriously moving and hidden wisdom of God, whose counsel is ever wonderful, and whose movements in the allotment of prosperity and adversity in the life of men of necessity have in them much that is mysterious.* Thus understood, these two chapters contain in them no inconsistency, no self-contradiction or obscurity, which could at all justify the suspicion of an interpolation—a suspicion which is moreover disproved by the decided similarity in language between this section and all the rest of the book.

II. *The descriptions of the behemoth and leviathan* (chs. xl., xli.), were first treated by Eichhorn (*Allg. Bibl. l. c.*) and Bertholdt as simply containing a transposition of certain passages; in particular the passage ch. xl. 32—xli. 3 was removed, and placed *after* the description of the leviathan, ch. xli. 4-26. Stuhlmann and Bernstein denied the genuineness of the latter section, ch. xli. 4-26. Ewald, E. Meier, Simson (*Zur Kritik des B. Hiob*, 1861, Dillmann, and Fürst [and Merx], however, deny the genuineness of all from ch. xl. 15 on (so also Eichhorn later in his *Einleitung ins Alte Test.*, V. 207 seq.). The author of the

* Hävernick says rightly (p. 366): "If, however, it might seem in view of this (*i. e.* in view of what is advanced by Job in ch. xxvii. 11 seq.) that the opponents of Job are in the right, this misconception is obviated by ch. xxviii. From the concession in ch. xxvii. it does not at all follow that we are to imitate the friends in their precipitate external way of judging and condemning. By so doing we overlook entirely the limits of human knowledge in relation to the divine wisdom. Accordingly ch. xxviii. proceeds to eulogize this wisdom in its secret depths, which no human research can fathom. For man the true possession of this wisdom consists in genuine godliness (ch. xxviii. 28 again connecting with ch. xxvii.), not in that immoderate conduct of the friends, by which they in fact put themselves in the place of God." Comp. also the remarks of Bouillier (*Observationes miscell.*, p. 255 seq.), and of Hirzel [pp. 161, 269], quoted by Hävernick.

interpolation is supposed to have been a Jew, living in Egypt during the sixth century, possibly a descendant of the fugitives who accompanied Jeremiah into that land, who by his vivid description of the animal prodigies of Egypt reveals himself as living on the Nile, but who also by his mention of the Jordan (ch. xl. 23) shows himself to have been well acquainted with Palestine. The principal arguments for the non-genuineness of this part of the book are the following:

a. The intent and scope of the discourse of God does not permit such a description of animals here. Such an illustration of the *power* of God in creation, outside of man, would be in place in the first discourse of God (chap. xxxviii., xxxix.), but not in this second discourse, which treats rather of the relation of the divine *justice* to men.—But such a separation of power from justice is altogether foreign to the poet's description. It is his purpose rather to exhibit both these attributes of God in His government of the world, the operation of His power, and that of His wisdom and justice, in their internal connection. The truth that under His strong arm God bows down everything, even the proud evil-doers, even the arrogance of the wicked man,—this truth is illustrated by the description of His influence in subjugating and governing the gigantic powers of nature, of which two animal colossi are here presented as representative examples. Behemoth and leviathan indeed figure to some extent as symbols of evil powers, hostile to God. This however is not to be understood in such a sense as would allow Satan, or Anti-Christ, to be concealed under them, as the allegoristic exegesis of an earlier age often assumed. Rather should both descriptions be taken as illustrations in the concrete of the fact that the Divine omnipotence is irresistible and invincible, whether it displays itself as creating, or destroying, as ruling the world, or as judging it.

b. It is claimed that the argumentative means here used are "not well chosen" for the end in view; for the reason, first of all, that "no animal whatever, not even behemoth and leviathan, is unconquerable by men (Gen. i. 29; ix. 2; Ps. viii.); and next because the two animals here described, being specifically Egyptian, were unknown to the Palestinian reader, and therefore must be described at length, if they were to be of use in the way of proof" (Dillmann).—Just as though the knowledge of nature, possessed by oriental antiquity, being necessarily limited as it was, would allow the same freedom of choice as that of which our modern knowledge might avail itself, from among hundreds of examples of colossal natural phenomena, which should be adapted to illustrate the Divine omnipotence.* And as though, when in Solomon's reign an active intercourse and a close acquaintance was instituted between Israel and Egypt, the great natural wonders of this very land [Egypt] would not be eminently available for the purposes of such illustration, and especially with a poet who delighted at all times in introducing that which was new, extraordinary, astounding, and foreign.

c. In an æsthetic respect, it is alleged, that the Section does not correspond to the ideal beauty and completeness of the rest of the poem; the "fugitive tender delicacy which characterizes the descriptions of animals given by the older poet" is entirely missing in the elaborate description of the two Egyptian beasts (Ewald). And apart from the prolixity, which is almost tedious, and the latitude of these descriptions, the discourse in those parts where it takes the form of questions and challenges from Jehovah (chap. xl. 25 seq.) "lacks the crushing power and the divine irony peculiar to the first discourse of God." Indeed much of it is "scarcely more than a rhetorical form," and the rhetorical change in chap. xli.

* Comp. in my *Theologia naturalis* (Frankfurt a. M. 1860) the Section on p. 239 seq.: "The aid furnished by the exact natural sciences in enlarging the Scriptural symbolical observation of nature," where, with express reference to the section of the book of Job now under consideration the idea is developed of an *amplification* and a multiplication of the æsthetic judgments respecting the theological significance of natural phenomena which come to us through the figures and comparisons of the Holy Scriptures. See especially p. 240: "Does not the æsthetic verdict of Holy Scripture delivered in Job xl. 20–xli. 25 respecting the leviathan, *i. e.*, the crocodile of the Nile, extend also to the monster alligators of America, and the gavial of the Ganges? Are we not compelled even to apply that which the Old Testament and the New Testament in so many passages say respecting the strength and rapacity of the lion, to the tiger both of the East Indies and of South America, of which no mention is made in the Bible? And would not this latter animal furnish us a still more striking image in many respects of the malice and rage of the soul-destroying arch-fiend, than the lion, according to 1 Peter v. 8?" *etc.*—See further on the subject below in Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks on chaps. xl. and xli.

4 exhibits "in the mouth of the God who appeared in the tempest a flatness which is simply intolerable" (Dillmann).—Against these subjective *dicta* of taste Umbreit has truly remarked: "Is then elaborateness of description prolixity? is art the same thing with artificialness? and is a calmly maintained objectivity after all mere flatness? Our poet is wholly immersed in the wondering contemplation of the two animal colossi; and a certain reality in their appearance has passed over into the very description. The same poetic painter who with wonderful reality produces before us the spirited war-horse charged with lifelike vigor, who sends the swift hawk on its rapid flight through the air, now at the end with equal skill in description traces out before our eyes the carefully articulated structure of those mighty monsters."—A point which must also be urged against the charge of prolixity is the fact that more detailed and circumstantial descriptions are elsewhere also in Old Testament poetry descriptive of nature and of morals, wont to alternate with such as are shorter and more cursory (in addition to chaps. xv., xviii., xx., xxviii., and xxxvi—xxxix. of our book, comp. Prov. vi. 6-8 [the ant]; Prov. vii. 5 seq. [the harlot]; Prov. xxxi. 10 seq. [the good wife]; Eccles. xii. 2 [the house of the body in old age]), and that a certain desultory irregularity of representation is everywhere peculiar to the poets of the Old Testament.

d. That *the character of the language* in the part before us has in it much that is peculiar, is also an assertion which rests on an æsthetic judgment, previously conceived, and which is already disposed of by the fact that its advocates themselves must produce a long series of characteristics in common with the rest of the poem (*e. g.*, chap. xl. 17, 18, 28, 30, 32; xli. 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 14, 15, 21, 22), which they then seek to explain by the supposition that these were borrowed from the genuine portions of the book (see particularly Dillmann, p. 355). The peculiarities of the section, alleged or real (*e. g.*, the use of בל chap. xli. 15 or בלי chap. xli. 18 as a negative before a simple verb, which is not found elsewhere in the poem) do not equal those correspondences in number or importance, and they can scarcely be attributed to any other cause than that any long section, especially in the domain of the poetry of natural description, must inevitably have its peculiarity of diction.

e. It is alleged that the long description of the two animals is altogether unnecessary to the *object* of the second discourse of God, which has already received a perfectly satisfactory conclusion in chap. xl. 6-14, while on the other hand chap. xli. 26 [34] forms no proper conclusion, and furnishes no intimation (such as we find in chap. xl. 2) that it is now the place for Job to speak. But the negative question in chap. xl. 9 requires a positive argument for its support, without which the second discourse of Jehovah would remain incomplete. Moreover this second discourse, if it really embraced only vers. 6-14 of the 40th chap. would be much too short in comparison with the first, and would fail to furnish the motive to Job's humble confession in chap. xlii. 2: he knows now that Jehovah can do *everything*. On the contrary the way seems well prepared for this acknowledgment by the proposition in chap. xli. 26 [34], which forms the climax to the description of the leviathan, which represents the crocodile as the monarch of all beasts, and thereby declares that the divine power revealed in the visible creation is glorious and invincible. It cannot be said of all accordingly that there is no inner connection between the description under consideration, and that which follows and precedes it. On the contrary the discourse of God would seem to be unsuitably shortened and mutilated, if we should cut off these descriptions of animals, which constitute the real point of it: see Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks on this section.

If then that which has been alleged against this section appears to resolve itself essentially into a matter of individual opinion and taste, the whole poetic kernel of the book would present itself to us as *one* well rounded, compacted, and unassailable work, cast at once and in one mould, were it not that against a still more extensive constituent of this whole suspicions have been directed, the grounds of which are exceedingly specious and cogent. These are the discourses of Elihu, which in a linguistic respect particularly exhibit much that is peculiar, and which have for that reason been rejected as foreign to the original form of the book by many critics who otherwise are very prudent and judicious.

§ 10. CONCLUSION—THE INTEGRITY OF THE POEM VINDICATED.

c. Against the assaults on the discourses of Elihu: Chap. xxxii—xxxvii.

It has been maintained that this entire episode is not an original constituent of the poem by Eichhorn (*Einleitung*, V., § 644 b), Stuhlmann, Bernstein, Knobel, D. v. Cölln (*Bibl. Theol.* I. 294), De Wette (*Einl.* § 287; in Schrader's *Neubearbeit.* § 350), E. Meier (in Zeller's *Theol. Jahrb.* 1844, p. 366 seq.), Ewald, Heiligstedt, Hirzel, Dillmann, Bleek, Hupfeld, Seinecke (*Der Grundgedanke des Buches Hiob*, 1863), Davidson (*Introd.* II. p. 204 seq.), Renan, Fürst [Merx], and several others, while the majority of exegetes and critics maintain its genuineness, especially Jahn (*Einl., etc.*, II. 776), Städlin (in his *Beiträgen zur Philosophie und Geschichte der Religion und Sittenlehre*, II. 133 seq.), Bertholdt, Gesenius (*Geschichte der hebr. Sprache und Schrift*, 1815, p. 34 seq.), Rosenmüller, Schärer, Umbreit, Arnheim, Gleiss, Friedländer, Steudel, (*Vorlesungen über die Theol. des Alten Test.*, 1840, *Beil.* III), Stickel, Vaihinger, Herbst, Welte, Hävernick, Keil, Hahn, Schlottmann, Hengstenberg (*Ev. Kchztg.* 1856, No. 16 seq.) [Good, Lee, Noyes, Wordsworth, Cook, Green, Carey, Barnes, and the English commentators generally.] Delitzsch pronounces no definite decision either for or against the genuineness, although he inclines on the whole to the opinion that these chapters were written not by the author of the principal poem, but by another, although not much later than the former; and he maintains emphatically that this slightly later author ("the second, or possibly the first issuer of the book") was not materially inferior to the principal poet in theological importance and in poetic value and merit.* The other opponents of the genuineness bring down the interpolator into an age considerably later. Some, Bernstein in particular, seek to establish his identity with the unknown author of the section in chap. xxvii. 7—xxviii. 28, which is in like manner rejected.

The principal *reasons urged against the genuineness* are the following:

1. The connection between Job's last discourse (chap. xxix–xxxi.) and the discourse of Jehovah, chap. xxxviii. seq., is removed; the conclusion of that discourse of Job's exhibits a manifest breaking off, a sudden interruption by the appearance of Jehovah which now takes place: in like manner chap. xxxviii. 1 seq. clearly presupposes, that Job, and not another, must have spoken immediately before Jehovah.

2. By anticipating the reference to God's infinite power and wisdom to which chapter xxxviii.-xli. give expression, the discourses of Elihu weaken the impression of the discourse of Jehovah; nay more they make it simply superfluous, in so far as they attempt to solve the problem under consideration in the way of *knowledge*, while Jehovah on the contrary requires unconditional submission beneath His omnipotence and secret wisdom.

3. We find neither in the prologue any preparation for the appearance of Elihu after the silencing of the friends—it does not mention him in a single syllable—nor in the Epilogue any reminder of his discourses. The latter fact would be all the more singular seeing that Elihu had, just as well as the three friends, assigned Job's guilt as the cause of his sufferings; we should therefore reasonably expect that the same censure would be visited on him as on them (see chap. xlii. 7), whereas in fact the divine sentence completely ignores him.

4. Moreover in view of the fact that Job himself makes no answer to Elihu the accusations of the latter acquire a position of peculiar isolation; after the incisive rejoinders which Job makes to the accusations of the three friends respectively, we necessarily expect that he will attend to Elihu's reproaches.

5. It is singular moreover that Elihu addresses Job several times by name (chap. xxxiii. 1, 31; xxxvii. 14), while neither the three friends nor Jehovah ever resort to such a mode of address.

6. There is a striking contrast between the diffuse and circumstantial way in which

*Commentary, Vol. II., p. 309: "There are neither linguistic, nor any other valid reasons in favor of assigning it to a much later period. He is the second issuer of the book, possibly the first, who brought to light the hitherto hidden treasure, enriched by his own insertion, which is inestimable in its relation to the history of the knowledge of the plan of redemption." Comp. also § 9, Vol. I., p. 26, of the Introduction, and also the pamphlet: "*Für und wider Kahnis*," 1863, p. 14.

Elihu is introduced, and the plain short announcement that is given of the appearance of the three friends (chap. ii. 11).

7. The way in which Elihu himself introduces himself (chap. xxxii. 6-xxxiii. 7) is not altogether void of offense, in so far as may be discerned in it an unsuitable self-praise, and a boastful commendation of his own merits.

8. While the older poet, "in contrast with the false doctrine of retribution, entirely separates sin and punishment or chastisement in the affliction of Job, and by inculcating the doctrine that there is an affliction endured by the righteous which is designed simply to test and prove their innocence, treats essentially the theme which in New Testament phraseology may be designated "the mystery of the Cross," Elihu leaves sin and suffering together as inseparable, and in opposition to the vulgar doctrine of retribution sets forth the distinction between disciplinary chastisement and judicial retribution. There appears thus a profound difference in the conception of the fundamental doctrine of the book between the two—the poet and his later supplementer—the latter aiming to moderate the boldness with which the former would represent the judicial decision of Jehovah as directly following upon Job's discussion with the three friends, and to make suitable preparation for the rigid sentence to be pronounced by God on both the contending parties (so at least Delitzsch in his Commy., II., p. 308, and in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, Art. "Hiob," p. 119).

9. There are several correspondences with the remainder of the book which "bear on them the impress of imitation; this is unmistakably the case with the entire section in chap. xxxvi. 26–xxxvii. 18, which has been prompted by the discourse of God in chap. xxxviii. seq.; and there are many such instances in thought and expression, such as chap. xxxiii. 7, 15; xxxiv. 3, 7, 21-24; xxxv. 5-8; xxxvi. 25; xxxvii. 4, 10, 11, 22," (so Hirzel and Dillmann).

10. The diction and the style of representation distinguish the author of Elihu's discourses most decisively from the author of the rest of the poem. "Not only has the language a strong Aramaic coloring, but Elihu uses regularly certain expressions, forms, and phrases, in place of which in the rest of the book other expressions are found just as regularly, and without distinction between the various speakers, which points not only to a difference in the roles, but also to a difference in the writers" (Hirzel). "Moreover the mode of representation on the one side shows greater breadth and wealth of words; on the other side it is more artificial and strained, often enough obscure, bombastic, and ambiguous. These peculiarities in the discourses of Elihu go far beyond the style of the poet elsewhere, when he distinguishes individual speakers by particular terms of expression, and favorite words and phrases. It is an inferior poet who discourses here, who is not to the same degree endowed with clearness of thought, poetic perception, and mastery of language. This is strikingly enough shown both in the structure of the verse, which often sinks down to mere prose, and in the plan of the discourses: the logical and the poetic divisions do not correspond; the strophe-structure fails" (Dillmann).

It is a powerful phalanx of charges and of reasons for doubt, external and internal, which we find arranged here. As respects their critical value however they are very unequal, and particularly are the first nine susceptible of easy refutation, which seek their support in the relation of the internal peculiarities of the section to the rest of the poem. We will examine them in their order.

1. It is not true to say that Elihu's discourse destroys the connection between Job's last discourse and that of Jehovah in chap. xxxviii. seq.: for the conclusion of that last discourse of Job's (chap. xxxi. 38-40) does not read as though it had been broken off, neither does the beginning of Jehovah's discourse (chap. xxxviii. 2) presuppose that Job had spoken immediately before, and had been interrupted. The exegesis of the passages referred to will exhibit both these points more in detail, and will at the same time prove that the close of Elihu's discourses by its solemn eulogy of the majesty of God furnishes a suitable *preparation* for His appearance; that probably also that storm in which God appears to Job (chap. xxxviii. 1; xl. 6) is intended by the poet to foreshadow and give occasion for the descriptions of nature which form the contents of these closing discourses (which are principally occupied

with the majestic phenomena that accompany a storm, which in several passages indeed point to Eloah as immediately present, or appearing as it were under the symbolic veil of clouds, thunder and lightning); and finally, that the absence of any recognition by Jehovah of that which has been spoken by Elihu is to be accounted for simply on the ground that Elihu's discussions served to prepare the way directly for the Divine decision, that *it was not necessary therefore* that Jehovah should define His position toward this speaker who stood on His side and pleaded His cause, but that He might recur at once to Job's last utterances.*

2. It is not at all the case that the impression of the discourses of Jehovah is weakened by the discourses of Elihu, which prepare the way for them, but do not for that reason anticipate them. For it is Elihu's aim to present *subjectively* Job's obligation to submit himself humbly to Jehovah, by contending against his false self-righteousness, comp. chap. xxxii. 1: כִּי הוּא צַדִּיק בְּעֵינָיו, for he accounted himself righteous), and by showing the need of thorough self knowledge, out of which true humility ever springs. Jehovah on the contrary follows with an argument proving the same thing *objectively*, by pointing out the unsearchableness of His eternal nature and activity, and also the wonderful fulness of His power and wisdom—attributes which already Elihu had also set forth, although more incidentally (see from chap. xxxvi. 22 on). The predominantly theoretic solution of the whole problem touching the significance of human suffering, which Elihu presents, a solution derived from the realm of knowledge, neither excludes nor supersedes the more profound practical solution which Jehovah presents in the realm of fact. On the contrary the fact that first of all there comes before us in Elihu a representative of *human* wisdom, and that of the more profound and solid order, attempting a correct solution of the problem in question, and that after him *God Himself* first brings about the absolute and final solution—all this rests on a plan thoroughly conceived by the author, which also accounts for the greater weight and magnificence of the language in Jehovah's discourse, and especially for the incomparably greater sublimity of the description of the divine power and wisdom which it contains. This gradation which the author manifestly intends between the discourses of Elihu and those of Jehovah, this absolute superiority of the latter over the former, both as regards their points of view, and the material and formal value of their utterances, shows how perverse and erroneous are both the judgments pronounced against them by their opponents—whether we take the judgment which declares that Elihu "says *more* than God," thus anticipating and superseding what He says, or the other judgment which declares that in his discourses no thought appears which is entirely new, which has not already shown itself in the older book" (Ewald, p. 320:—against which comp. Hävernick, III., 373, also what we have to say below against Dillmann in Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks on chaps. xxxvi., xxxvii.)

3. The silence of the prologue and the epilogue respecting Elihu proves nothing in behalf of the view that the speeches of the latter have been interpolated. For *a:* It is an unsuitable requirement that the author should announce beforehand in the prologue all the persons who are to be introduced into the poem. He would then have had to announce Jehovah also as one who was later to make His appearance in the circle of disputants. Together with the contending parties (to wit Job on the one side, and the three friends on the other), he must have mentioned beforehand the two adjudicators, the human and the divine, whom he intends to introduce at the close. He would thus have had to bring forward in the introduction all the actors in the piece, which in view of the peculiarity of the dramatic poetry of the Old Testament (comp. Canticles) could not have been required nor expected of him.—*b:* The fact that Elihu was not condemned in the epilogue is to be explained simply on the ground *that he deserved no sentence of condemnation*, because he had affirmed Job's guilt in quite another sense than Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar—a sense which far more nearly

* Hahn's assertion, that Elihu, so far from speaking on the side of God, simply repeats in substance the accusations of the three friends against Job; that he is accordingly intentionally ignored by Jehovah, and "thereby put in the position of one who had spoken as though he had not spoken" (p. 20), is refuted more specifically below in the Commy. Here we would simply call attention beforehand to the consideration how greatly the difficulty of defending the discourses of Elihu is increased by so exaggerating the inadequacy and defectiveness of the solution of the problem attempted by Elihu, and generally speaking, by so unfavorable a verdict on Elihu's stand-point and character (such as is found in Hahn, and formerly in Herder and Umbreit).

approximated the absolute truth, and because, generally speaking, he did not put himself forward as a one-sided partisan, but from the first as an umpire and a provisional mediator between the parties. "A censure of Elihu in the epilogue would have been equivalent to a declaration that Job was absolutely innocent; this, however, was so far from being the case, that Job on the contrary earnestly repents for having sinned against God, ch. xlii. 6" (Hävernick, p. 374).*

4. Moreover the silence of Job towards Elihu has nothing at all strange about it, if we only keep properly in mind the distinction, or rather the contrast, just set forth between the three friends, as a party contending against Job, and Elihu, who is already lifted above this party-strife, and who anticipates the divine decision.

5. That Elihu sometimes addresses Job by name is also to be explained by his position as mediator between the parties. He has to deal not only with Job, but also, as ch. xxxii. 3, 6 seq. shows, just as much with the friends. There is accordingly in the fact that he, in contrast with them, expressly addresses Job a few times nothing more strange, nothing that is at all more conclusive against the genuineness of his speeches than in the fact that Jehovah in the epilogue mentions "His servant Job" not less than four times (ch. xlii. 7, 8).

6. The alleged prolixity and diffuseness with which Elihu is introduced in ch. xxxii. 2-6 exists only in the prejudice or taste of the critics. "Without these introductory words, which contain throughout nothing unnecessary, we should not know at all how to regard Elihu, whether as a disputant, or as a judge" (Hahn). An exact portrait of the personality of the new speaker was absolutely necessary, if his words as to their contents were to be correctly apprehended. Especially was there needed a preliminary intimation of the moral characteristics which above all qualified him to be an umpire between the contestants, and to be God's advocate—of his *piety*, which caused him to take offence at Job's self-righteousness (ver. 2); of his *wisdom*, which made him appear superior to the three friends, to their narrow-mindedness and short-sightedness (ver. 3); and of his modesty, which had hindered him from beginning to speak before the other speakers, as being older than himself. This introduction could certainly not be shorter, and convey all this; and there can be discovered in it no sufficient ground for suspecting its genuineness.

7. In like manner the opinion that Elihu's introduction of himself ch. xxxii. 6—xxxiii. 7 is not free from much that is objectionable, that in particular it exhibits vain self-conceit and boastfulness, resolves itself at bottom into a matter of subjective taste and critical prepossession. That the assurance of his humble and modest disposition with which he begins, is not empty boasting is evident from the *fact* that he has thus far persevered in keeping silent, and that too when so much has been said which might have provoked him much sooner to express his views. The reasons which he assigns for speaking now (ch. xxxii. 15-20), for his inability to keep still and to restrain himself any longer (comp. Matt. xii. 34), have in this connection certainly nothing objectionable or strange about them. They present themselves rather as a well-applied and necessary *captatio benevolentiæ*. Moreover what he says further on in respect to the rigid impartiality which he had laid down as a law for himself (ch. xxxii. 21, 22), as also that finally which he observes particularly against Job (ch. xxxiii. 1-7) contains nothing which can cause offence to an unprejudiced consideration of the case, or even to such a view respecting Elihu in an æsthetic or moral respect as might not be altogether favorable. And just here should be noted his unconditional submission to God's word and will, of which we have a beautiful exhibition, and one which distinguishes him as a truly humble representative of divine truth (see ch. xxxii. 22; xxxiii. 6).

8. The attempt of Delitzsch to show that Elihu's solution of the problem is radically different from that of the principal poet is one-sided, as may easily be seen. The conception

* Comp. also the words of Pareau in his Commy. here appropriately cited by Hävernick: "For since the author's own plan requires that we should look on Elihu as having come to Job, not that he might speak himself, but that being younger in years, he might hear others speak (ch. xxxii. 4-7), the author wisely and suitably resolved not to mention him before necessity required it. Neither was there any need for making any mention of him in the epilogue, seeing that in the whole argument and plan of his discourses there was nothing which merited rebuke. Nay more, they are as a whole honorably confirmed by the whole tenor of God's discourses; and in causing this honor to be conferred on Elihu in fact rather than in words, the author shows an exquisite regard for propriety which I cannot help recognizing."

of sufferings which Elihu maintains is that of purifying chastisements, by which even those who are apparently innocent are justly visited. According to the profound view of the purpose of the suffering inflicted on the innocent which is inculcated by Jehovah and by the author of the whole poem it serves to prove and test their innocence. Evidently the former view, so far from excluding the latter, *logically* precedes it as its necessary premise. So also does the individual heart-experience of all God's people who are brought through such trials *actually* illustrate, in the same way that the plastic development of our poem illustrates *dramatically*, this progress from what is as yet a semi-legal view of the suffering of the innocent, to that view which the New Testament presents, and which is illuminated by the mystery of the cross (comp. above, § 4). In the sufferings of Him who was the Most Innocent of all innocent sufferers, we find these two uses of suffering combined: its purifying and sanctifying influence (not indeed on the sufferer himself, but on those *for* and *instead of* whom He suffered), and also its use in triumphantly attesting His holiness and purity before God and men. And indeed the most perfect and clear Old Testament type of this New Testament redemptive suffering, the Servant of God in Isaiah (ch. liii.), presents in intimate union these two aspects of the significance of His sufferings, their use in purifying and transforming, and their use in proving and attesting. The fact accordingly that in Job's case Elihu puts forward almost exclusively the tendency of suffering to chasten and to purify, whereas Jehovah sets forth more especially its probational tendency, furnishes no argument whatever against the unity of our poem. Comp. also below, Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks on chs. xxxvi., xxxvii., No. 2.

9. The several correspondences in thought and expression between this section and passages in the rest of the poem may just as satisfactorily be explained as repetitions, such as may naturally be looked for from the same author, rather than as imitations by a later interpolator. Indeed in order to prove that they are of the latter class, it would be necessary to "show that there is a weakness in the representation, that the borrowed words or thoughts exceed the requirements of the passage, that the matter thus inwoven is unsuitable" (Stickel). But this cannot be shown with regard to any of the correspondences between Elihu's speeches and the rest of the book, and least of all with regard to the passage on which the main stress is laid by Hirzel, Dillmann and others in chap. xxxvi. 26–xxxvii. 18,—a passage which certainly indicates close affinity with the following discourses of Jehovah, no such affinity however as may not be easily and satisfactorily explained by the relation which the passage in Elihu occupies as *preparatory* to the sublime descriptions in God's discourse.

10. The most weighty of all these arguments of the opposition is that derived from the peculiar style and diction of the section. Even this argument is not unanswerable, however, as is evident from what Stickel in particular has said in reply to it (p. 248 seq.). The list of real or apparent idiotisms in the section may be reduced to the following:

a. A considerable number of correspondences with the linguistic usage of the book of Proverbs, with which however the rest of the poem indicates no slight affinity (comp. § 6, at the beginning).

b. Certain peculiarities of expression, which recur with considerable regularity, especially דֵּעַ instead of דַּעַת (chap. xxxii. 6, 10, 17; xxxvi. 3), עָוֶל instead of עַוְלָה (ch. xxxiv. 10, 32; comp. chap. xxxvi. 23, where the more common form is found), נֹעַר instead of נְעוּרִים (chap. xxxiii. 25; xxxvi. 14), and כָּנָה (chap. xxxii. 21, 22).

c. Three *hapaxlegomena*: אָבִי, chap. xxxiv. 36; חַת, ch. xxxiii. 9; and אֶכֶף, ch. xxxiii. 7—a number which is not surprisingly large for a piece of poetry of the length of our section. We might place alongside of them about an equal number out of the following discourses of Jehovah.

d. A number of Aramaisms, comparatively somewhat larger than are found in the rest of the poem. This strong Aramaic coloring however can be explained without difficulty by supposing that the author desires to make prominent the Aramaic origin of Elihu as one belonging to the tribe of Buz (chap. xxxii. 2), and to represent him as belonging to quite another race than the three friends. For whereas there were only slight differences of diction distinguishing the speeches of the three friends both from each other and from Job (see § 3,

Rem. 1), there is clearly presented in Elihu the representative of another dialect. And that it is the poet's intention to invest him with this distinctive coloring, is particularly signified by the fact that the Aramaizing forms abound *most of all at the beginning of the discourses* (chap. xxxii. 6 seq.), and again at the beginning of the fourth principal section of the same (chap. xxxvi. 2), whereas elsewhere they are less prominent. Perhaps also those other peculiarities of expression which have been cited under *b* may be derived from this wish of the poet to cause this new speaker to express himself in a peculiar dialect. Comp. on ch. xxxii. 2. The same may be said of those qualities of the style with which de Wette, Dillmann, and others, have found fault, the traces of greater flatness, of less clearness of representation, of a defective command of language, all of which may be largely attributed to the effort of the speaker after a characteristic coloring of speech. But the charge that the rhythmic construction of the section is comparatively incomplete, that the structure of his verse "sinks down to downright prose," or even that "the strophe structure is wanting," has in it decided exaggerations. For in the remainder of the poem also a more lax rhythmic structure, and one that more nearly approximates prose, alternates with a more compact, full, and symmetrical strophe-structure. And to say that the latter is wholly wanting here, would seem, in view of strophical constructions so distinctly outlined and so consistently maintained, as we find exhibited particularly in the fourth speech of Elihu (*e. g.* chap. xxxvi. 22 seq.; xxxvii. 1, 6, 11 seq.) to be in the last degree incorrect; comp. above § 3.

In view of all that has been said there remains no decisive reason against the genuineness of this section, not even in the domain of language and style; for that our poet possessed in sufficient measure vivacity of intellect and versatility of invention to be able to individualize the characters of his poem by attributing to them dialectic variations of language is sufficiently apparent from the skill with which he had already succeeded in distinguishing the three friends from each other and from Job by the peculiar impress stamped upon their speech, and the skill with which he had bestowed on Jehovah's discourses at the close the characteristic coloring which they consistently retain throughout. The purpose however to endow Elihu especially, the immediate predecessor of Jehovah, and the precursor of the decision announced by Him with a style the coloring of which should be peculiarly marked, sprang with an internal necessity out of the scope and plan of the whole, the profound and correct perception of which would forbid the possible doubt whether these speeches belonged to the poem as a whole, and would even supersede the mildest form of this doubt to which Delitzsch inclines with his theory of a *double* "promulgation" [*Herausgabe*] of the book,—the first time *without*, the second *with* Elihu's speeches.

§ 11. PARTICULAR ANALYSIS OF THE CONTENTS OF THE BOOK.

Not until we have established the unity of our book against the various assaults made upon it does it become possible to give an outline of its contents in detail, and thereby to set forth in their completeness the poet's plan, and its elaboration (comp. the preliminary summary of the contents in § 1, together with the remarks made in § 3, respecting the artistic plan of the poem). In the outline herewith presented we follow substantially Vaihinger (*Das Buch Hiob*, 2d Ed., p. 227 seq.), without however adhering in every particular to his divisions, which at times are somewhat arbitrary. This arbitrary feature consists chiefly in an exaggerated endeavor everywhere and down to the minutest detail to find *Triads* in the divisions of the poem. The undeniable predilection of the poet for the triadic arrangement in his speeches gives some foundation no doubt for this theory, although it does not justify our carrying such tri-partitions to a wanton excess. Several other modern expositors also furnish a thorough outline in detail of the contents of the poem, *e. g.* Ewald (p. 34 seq.), Schlottmann (p. 20 seq.), Davidson (*Introduction*, p. 174 seq.), but without giving *sufficient* prominence to that tripartite arrangement. [See also Carey, p. 37 seq.]

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION (IN PROSE): CHAP. I. 1.

1. Job's character and course of life: chap. i. 1-5.
2. The Divine decree to try Job through suffering.
   a. The milder form of trial by taking away his possessions: chap. i. 6-22.
      α. The preparatory scene in heaven: vers. 6-12.
      β. The execution of the decree of trial on the possessions and family of Job: vers. 13-19.
      γ. Job's constancy and patience: vers. 20-22.
   b. The severer trial by the loss of health: chap. ii. 1-10.
      α. The preparatory scene in heaven; vers. 1-6.
      β. The fulfillment of the decree in Job's terrible disease: vers. 7, 8.
      γ. Job's steadfastness in piety: vers. 9, 10.
3. The visit of the friends, and their mute sympathy, as an immediate preparation for the action of the poem: chap. ii. 11-13.

First Chief Division of the poem: The Entanglement, or the controversial discourses of Job and his three friends: Chaps. III.—XXVIII.

The Outbreak of Job's Despair, as the theme and the immediate occasion of the Colloquy: Chap. III. 1-26.

a. Job curses his day: vers. 1-10.
b. He wishes that he were in the realm of the dead rather than in this life: vers. 11-19.
c. He asks why he, being weary of life, must still live: vers. 20-26.

First Series of controversial discourses: The Entanglement in its beginning: Chaps. IV.–XIV.

I. Eliphaz and Job: Chaps. IV.–VII.

A. The accusation of Eliphaz: Man must not speak against God, as Job is doing: Chaps. IV., V.
1. Introductory reproof of Job, on account of his unmanly complaint, by which he could only incur God's wrath: chap. iv. 4-11.
2. Account of a heavenly revelation, which declared to him the wrongfulness and foolishness of weak sinful man's raving against God: chap. iv. 12–v. 7.
3. Admonition to repentance, as the only means by which Job can recover God's favor, and his former happy estate: chap. v. 8-26.

B. Job's Reply: Instead of comfort the friends bring him only increased sorrow: Chaps. VI., VII.
1. Justification of his complaint by pointing out the greatness and incomprehensibleness of his suffering: chap. vi. 1-10.
2. Complaint on account of the bitter disappointment which he had experienced at the hands of his friends: vers. 11-30.
3. Recurrence to his former complaint on account of his lot, and an accusation of God: chap. vii.

II. Bildad and Job: Chaps. VIII.—X.

A. Bildad's rebuke: Man must not charge God with injustice, as Job has done, for God never does wrong: Chap. VIII.
1. Censure of Job on account of his unjust accusation against God: vers. 2-7.
2. Reference to the wise teachings of the ancients, in respect to the merited end of those who forget God: vers. 8-19.
3. A softened application of these teachings to the case of Job: vers. 20-22.

B. Job's Reply: Assertion of his innocence, and a mournful description of the incomprehensibleness of his suffering as a dark horrible destiny: Chap. IX., X.

1. God is certainly the Almighty and ever-righteous One, who is to be feared; but His power is too terrible for mortal man: chap. ix. 2-12.
2. The oppressive effect of this omnipotence and arbitrariness of God impels him, as an innocent sufferer, to presumptuous speeches against God: chap. ix. 13-35.
3. A plaintive description of the merciless severity with which God rages against him, although, as an Omniscient Being, He knows that he is innocent: ch. x. 1-22.

III. Zophar and Job: Chaps. XI.—XIV.

A. Zophar's violent arraignment of Job, as one who needs to submit in penitence to the all-seeing and all-righteous God: Chap. XI.

1. Expression of the desire that the Omniscient One would appear to convince Job of his guilt: vers. 2–6.
2. Admonitory description of the impossibility of contending against God's omniscience, which charges every man with sin: vers. 7-12.
3. The truly penitent has in prospect the restoration of his prosperity, for the wicked however there remains no hope: vers. 13-20.

B. Job's Reply: Attack upon his friends, whose wisdom and justice he earnestly questions: Chaps. XII.—XIV.

1. Ridicule of the assumed wisdom of the friends, who can give only a very unsatisfactory description of the exalted power and wisdom of the divine activity: chap. xii.
2. The resolution to betake himself to God, the righteous Judge, who, in contrast with the harshness and injustice of the friends, will assuredly do him justice: chap. xiii. 1-22.
3. A vindication of himself addressed to God, beginning with the haughty asseveration of his own innocence, but relapsing into a despondent cheerless description of the brevity, helplessness, and hopelessness of man's life: chap. xiii. 23–xiv. 22.

Second Series of controversial discourses: The Entanglement increasing: Chaps. XV.–XXI.

I. Eliphaz and Job: Chaps. XV.—XVII.

A. Eliphaz: God's punitive justice is revealed only against evil-doers: Chap. XV.

1. Recital, with accompanying rebuke, of all in Job's discourses and conduct that is perverted, and that bears witness against his innocence: vers. 2-19.
2. A didactic admonition on the subject of the retributive justice of God in the destiny of the ungodly: vers. 20-35.

B. Job: Although oppressed by his disconsolate condition, he nevertheless wishes and hopes that God will demonstrate his innocence against the unreasonable accusations of his friends: Chaps. XVI., XVII.

(A brief preliminary repudiation of the discourses of the friends as aimless and unprofitable: chap. xvi. 2-5).

1. Lamentation on account of the disconsolateness of his condition, as forsaken and hated by God and men: chap. xvi. 6-17.
2. Vivid expression of the hope of the future recognition of his innocence: chap. xvi. 18–xvii. 9.
3. Sharp censure of the admonitory speeches of the friends as unreasonable, and as having no power to comfort: chap. xvii. 10-16.

II. Bildad and Job: Chaps. XVIII., XIX.

A. Bildad: Job's passionate outbreaks are useless, for the divine ordinance, instituted from of old, is still in force, securing that the hardened sinner's merited doom shall suddenly and surely overtake him: Chap. XVIII.

1. Sharp rebuke of Job, the foolish and blushing boaster: vers. 2-4.
2. Description of the dreadful doom of the hardened evil-doer: vers. 5-21.

B. Job: His misery is well-deserving of sympathy; it will however all the more certainly end in his conspicuous vindication by God, although not perhaps till the life beyond: Chap. XIX.

(Introduction: Reproachful censure of the friends for maliciously suspecting his innocence: vers. 2-5).

1. Sorrowful complaint because of the suffering inflicted on him by God and men: vs. 6-20.
2. An uplifting of himself to a blessed hope in God, his future Redeemer and Avenger: vers. 21-27.
3. Earnest warning to the friends against the further continuance of their unfriendly attacks: vers. 28, 29.

III. Zophar and Job: Chaps. XX., XXI.

A. Zophar: For a time indeed the evil-doer can be prosperous, but so much the more terrible and irremediable will be his destruction: Chap. XX.

1. Introduction, violently censuring Job, and theme of the discourse: vers. 2-5.
2. Expansion of the theme, showing from experience that the prosperity and riches of the ungodly must end in the deepest misery: vers. 6-29.

B. Job: That which experience teaches concerning the prosperity of the wicked during their life on earth argues not against, but for his innocence: Chap. XXI.

1. Calm, but bitter introductory appeal to the friends: vers. 2-6.
2. Along with the fact of the prosperity of the wicked, taught by experience, (vers. 7-16), stands the other fact of earthly calamities befalling the pious and righteous: vers. 7-26.
3. Rebuke of the friends for setting forth only one side of that experience, and using that to his prejudice: vers. 27-34.

Third Series of controversial discourses: The Entanglement reaching its extreme point: Chap. XXII.—XXVIII.

I. Eliphaz and Job: Chap. XXII.—XXIV.

A. Eliphaz: Reiterated accusation of Job, from whose severe sufferings it must of necessity be inferred that he had sinned grievously, and needed to repent. Chap. xxii.

1. The charge made openly that Job is a great sinner: vers. 2-10.
2. Earnest warning not to incur yet severer punishments: vers. 11 20.
3. Admonition to repent, accompanied by the announcement of the certain restoration of his prosperity to him, when penitent: vers. 21-30.

B. Job: Inasmuch as God withdraws Himself from him, and that moreover His allotment of men's destinies on earth is in many ways most unequal, the incomprehensibleness of His dealings may thus be inferred, as well as the short-sightedness and one-sidedness of the external theory of retribution held by the friends: chapter xxiii–xxiv.

1. The wish for a judicial decision by God in his favor is repeated, but is repressed by the agonizing thought that God intentionally withdraws from him, in order that He may not be obliged to vindicate him in this life: Chap. xxiii.
2. The darkness and unsearchableness of God's ways to be recognized in many other instances of an unequal distribution of earthly prosperity among men, as well as in Job's case: Chap. xxiv.

II. Bildad and Job: Chap. XXV.—XXVI.

A. Bildad: Again setting forth the contrast between God's exaltation and human impotence: Chap. xxv.

1. Man cannot argue with God: vers. 2-4.
2. Man is not pure before God: vers. 5–6.

B. Job: Rebuke of his opponent, accompanied by a description, far surpassing his, of the exaltation and greatness of God: Chap. xxvi.

1. Sharp Rebuke of Bildad: vers. 2-4.
2. Description of the incomparable sovereignty and exaltation of God, given to eclipse the far less spirited attempt of Bildad in this direction: vers. 5-14.

III. Job alone: His closing address to the vanquished friends: Chap. XXVII.-XXVIII.

a. Renewed solemn asseveration of his innocence, accompanied by a reference to his joy in God, which had not forsaken him even in the midst of his deepest misery: Chap. xxvii. 2-10.

b. Statement of his belief that the prosperity of the ungodly cannot endure, but that they must infallibly come to a terrible end: Chap. xxvii. 11-23.

c. Declaration that true Wisdom, which alone can secure real well-being, and a correct solution of the dark enigmas of man's destiny on earth, is to be found nowhere on earth, but only with God, and by means of a pious submission to God: Chap. xxviii.

Second Chief Division of the Poem. Disentanglement of the mystery through the discourses of Job, Elihu and Jehovah: Chap. XXIX.—XLII. 6.

First stage of the disentanglement: Chap. XXIX.—XXXI.

Job's Soliloquy,

Setting forth the truth that his suffering was not due to his moral conduct, that it must have therefore a deeper cause. [The negative side of the solution of the problem.]

1. Yearning retrospect at the fair prosperity of his former life: Chap. xxix.
   a. Describing the outward aspect of this former prosperity: vers. 2-10.
   b. Pointing out the inward cause of this prosperity—his benevolence and righteousness: vers. 11-17.
   c. Describing that feature of his former prosperity which he now most painfully misses, namely, the universal honor shown him, and his far-reaching influence: vers. 18-25.
2. Sorrowful description of his present sad estate: Chap. xxx.
   a. The ignominy and contempt he receives from men: vers. 1-15.
   b. The unspeakable misery which everywhere oppresses him: vers. 16-23.
   c. The disappointment of all his hopes: vers. 24–31.

3. Solemn asseveration of his innocence in respect to all open and secret sins: Chap. xxxi.
   a. He has abandoned himself to no wicked lust: vers. 1-8.
   b. He has acted uprightly in all the relations of his domestic life: vers. 9-15.
   c. He has constantly practiced neighborly kindness and justice in civil life: vers. 16-23.
   d. He has moreover not violated his more secret obligations to God and his neighbor: vers. 24-32.
   e. He has been guilty furthermore of no hypocrisy, nor mere semblance of holiness, of no secret violence, or avaricious oppression of his neighbor: vers. 33-40.

Second stage of the disentanglement: Chap. xxxii.-xxxvii.

Elihu's Discourses,

Devoted to proving that there can be really no undeserved suffering, that on the contrary the sufferings decreed for those who are apparently righteous are dispensations of divine love, designed to purify and sanctify them through chastisement. [The first half of the positive solution of the problem].

Introduction: Elihu's appearance, and the exordium of his discourse, giving the reasons for his speaking: Chap. xxxii. 1—xxxiii. 7.

1. Elihu's appearance (related in prose): Chap. xxxii. 1-6 *a.*
2. An explanation addressed to the previous speakers, showing why he takes part in this controversy: vers. 6-10.
3. Setting forth that he was justified in taking part, because the friends had shown, and still showed themselves unable to refute Job: vers. 11-22.
4. A special appeal to Job to listen calmly to him, as a mild judge of his guilt and weakness: Chap. xxxiii. 1-7.

First Discourse: Of man's guilt before God: Chap. xxxiii. 8-33.
   a. Preparatory: Reproof of Job's confidence in his perfect innocence: vers. 8-11.
   b. Didactic discussion of the true relation of sinful men to God, who seeks to warn and to save them by various dispensations, and communications from above: vers. 12-30.
      α. By the voice of conscience in dreams: (vers. 15-18).
      β. By sickness and other sufferings (vers. 19-22).
      γ. By sending a mediating angel to deliver in distress (vers. 23 seq.).
   c. Calling upon Job to give an attentive hearing to the discourses by which he would further instruct him: vers. 31-33.

Second Discourse: Proof that man is not right in doubting God's righteousness: Ch. xxxiv.
   a. Opening: Censure of the doubt of God's righteousness expressed by Job: vers. 1-9.
   b. Proof that the divine righteousness is necessary, and that it really exists:
      α. From God's disinterested love of His creatures: vers. 10-15.
      β. From the idea of God as ruler of the world: vers. 16-30.
   c. Exhibition of Job's inconsistency and folly in reproaching God with injustice, and at the same time appealing to his decision: vers. 31-37.

Third Discourse: Refutation of the false position that piety is not productive of happiness to men: Chap. xxxv.
   a. The folly of the erroneous notion that it is of small advantage to men whether they are pious or ungodly: vers. 1-8.
   b. The real reason why the deliverance of the sufferer is often delayed, viz.:
      α. The lack of true godly fear: vers. 9-14.
      β. Dogmatic and presumptuous speeches against God, which was the case especially with Job: vers. 15-16.

Fourth Discourse: A vivid exhibition of the activity of God, which is seen to be benevolent, as well as mighty and just, both in the destinies of men, and in the natural world outside of man: Chap. xxxvi.-xxxvii.

[Introduction—announcing that further important contributions are about to be made to the vindication of God: Chap. xxxvi. 1-4].

a. Vindication of the divine justice, manifesting itself in the destinies of men as a power benevolently chastening and purifying them: Chap. xxxvi. 5-21:

α. In general: vers. 5-15.

β. In Job's change of fortune in particular: vers. 16-21.

b. Vindication of the Divine Justice, revealing itself in nature as supreme power and wisdom: Chap. xxxvi. 22; xxxvii. 25.

α. Consideration of the wonders of nature as revelations of divine wisdom and power: ch. xxxvi. 22—xxxvii. 13.

(1) Rain, clouds and storms, lightning and thunder: ch. xxxvi. 22—xxxvii. 5.

(2) The agencies of winter—such as snow, rain, the north wind, frost, *etc.* Ch. xxxvii. 6-13.

β. Finally admonitory inferences from what precedes for Job: ch. xxxvii. 14-24. The third stage of the disentanglement: ch. xxxviii. 1—xlii. 6.

Jehovah's Discourses:

the aim of which is to prove that the Almighty and only wise God, with whom no mortal should dispute, might also ordain suffering simply to prove and test the righteous. [The second half of the positive solution of the problem.]

First Discourse of Jehovah, together with Job's answer: With God, the Almighty and only wise, no man may dispute: ch. xxxviii. 1—xl. 5.

1. Introduction: The appearance of God; His demand that Job should answer him: ch. xxxviii. 1-3.
2. God's questions touching His power revealed in the wonders of creation: ch. xxxviii. 4—xxxix. 30.
   - *a.* Questions respecting the process of creation: vers. 4-15.
   - *b.* Respecting the inaccessible heights and depths above and below the earth, and the forces proceeding from them: vers. 16-27.
   - *c.* Respecting the phenomena of the atmosphere, and the wonders of the starry heavens: vers. 28-38.
   - *d.* Respecting the preservation and propagation of wild animals, especially of the lion, raven, wild goat, stag, wild ass, oryx, ostrich, war-horse, hawk and eagle: ch. xxxviii. 39—xxxix. 30.
3. Conclusion of the discourse, together with Job's answer announcing his humble submission: ch. xl. 1-5.

Second Discourse of Jehovah, together with Job's answer: To doubt God's justice, which is most closely allied to His wonderful omnipotence, is a grievous wrong, which must be atoned for by sincere penitence: ch. xl. 6—xlii. 6.

1. Sharp rebuke of God's presumption which has been carried to the point of doubting God's justice: ch. xl. 7-14.
2. Humiliating demonstration of the weakness of Job in contrast with certain creatures of earth, not to say with God: shown by a description
   - *a.* Of the behemoth (hippopotamus): ch. xl. 15-24.
   - *b.* Of the leviathan (crocodile), as king of all beasts: ch. xl. 25—xli. 26.

Jobs

3. Job's answer: Humble acknowledgment of the infinitude of the divine power, and penitent confession of his sin and folly: ch. xlii. 1-6.

Historical Conclusion (in prose): ch. xlii. 7-17.

1. Glorious vindication of Job before his friends: vers. 7-10.
2. The restoration of his former dignity and honor: vers. 11, 12 *a*.
3. The doubling of his former prosperity in respect to his earthly possessions and his offspring: vers. 12 *b*-17.

§ 12. HISTORY AND LITERATURE OF THE EXPOSITION OF THE BOOK.

The history of the exposition of the book of Job, like that of the other Old Testament writings, embraces three principal epochs or stages of development: I. *The Ancient Church and Mediæval period*, which was characterized by a one-sided Messianic allegorical interpretation of the book, and by the dependence of commentators (who were almost altogether ignorant of Hebrew) on the authority of the Septuagint and Vulgate.*—II. *The age of the Reformation, and that immediately following* (down to the middle of the 18th Cent.). The commentators of this period, particularly of the evangelical school, by virtue of their independent knowledge of Hebrew, and their more free apprehension of the book as an organic living whole, advanced beyond the stand-point of the former age. They did not really succeed, however, in releasing themselves from the fetters of an unhistorical dogmatism, and of a lifeless scholasticism, indulging in abstract summaries, but unable to rise to an independent view of the successive stages in the Old Testament history of redemption. III. *The modern age of scientific criticism*, beginning with the middle of the last century. During this period the knowledge of the languages and of the whole civilization of the East has been continually increasing in extent and exactness, and has been accompanied on the one side by a more rigid and pure historical perception, on the other by an appreciation, as complete and correct as possible, of the profound theological contents of our book, and thus by an apprehension of its divine-human contents and character as a whole.—The *first* of these periods, the principal achievements of which are represented by the names of the Church Fathers Origen and Gregory the Great, embraces also that group of Jewish Rabbinical commentators, who appear as the forerunners of the more advanced linguistic culture and exegesis of the Reformation, such as Rashi, Aben Ezra, Nachmanides, Levi ben Gerson, and the converted Nicolas de Lyra. During the *second* epoch, which has for its most meritorious representatives Joh. Brentius, Seb. Schmidt, Mercier and Cocceius, the standpoint of the modern period is heralded by Le Clerc and Alb. Schultens, in the case of the former by his free critical method, in the case of the latter by his application to the business of exposition of a comprehensive knowledge of the Shemitic languages.—In the last, or *third* epoch we distinguish a period of rationalistic shallowness of exegesis (joined to a defective estimate of the book in accordance with the standard of an exaggerated orientalism, or of a sentimental humanism), and a period during which exegesis has acquired greater depth in the direction of a scriptural theology, and greater critical purity. The former period, extending from 1750–1820, is characterized by such expositors as Moldenhauer, the younger Schultens, Stuhlmann, Schärer, Rosenmüller; the latter period, to which Umbreit, Koster and Ewald form the transition, has representatives of pre-eminent ability, and distinguished for solid achieve-

* In respect to the low value of the Alexandrian version of the book of Job see Delitzsch (Commy. I., p. 35): "It is just the Greek translation of the book of Job which suffers most seriously from the flaws which in general affect the Septuagint. Whole verses are omitted, others are removed from their original places, and the omissions are filled up by apocryphal additions." See more fully the work of G. Bickell: *De indole ac ratione versionis Alexandrinæ in interpretando libro Jobi*, Marburgi, 1863; also the Dissertations of Krause and Krehl, mentioned below in the "Monographic Literature," *a.*—In respect to the *Latin* versions of Job current in the Ancient Church, viz. the Itala before Jerome, the Itala as revised by Jerome after the Hexaplar text of Origen, and Jerome's translation in the Vulgate, rendered independently from the original text—see Delitzsch, *l. c.*, and my book on Jerome, p. 181 seq.—In respect to the Syrian translation of Job in the Peshito, made from the original text, and also in respect to the later version of the same after the Hexaplar text by Paul of Tela, about 620, comp. Delitzsch (I., p. 36), Middeldorpf: *Curæ hexaplares in Jobum*, 1817; also the last edition of the Syro-Hexaplar version, 1834–35.

ments, in Hirzel, Vaihinger, Hahn, Schlottmann, Delitzsch and Dillmann, as also in the English writers Lee, Carey and A. B. Davidson.

THE LITERATURE OF THE SUBJECT IN DETAIL.

I. PERIOD: ANCIENT AND MEDIÆVAL.

A. Christian Commentators.—*Greek Fathers,* including specially Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Olympiodorus (deacon of Alexandria about A. D. 600), *etc.*, in all 22, whose writings are collected together in *Catena Græc. Patrum in l. Job, collectore Niceta, græce ed.* et *lat. vers. op. et stud. Patricii Junii,* Lond. 1637, fol.—*Syrian Fathers,* especially Ephraem; comp. Froriep; *Ephraemiana in libr. Jobi,* 1769, 4.—*Latin Fathers:* Augustine: *Annotationes in l. Job* (Opp. ed. Bened. Par. 1679 seq. T. III.); Gregory the Great: *Expositio in beat. Job, s. Moralium l. l.* XXXV.; Pseudo-Jerome (Philippus?): *Expositio Interlinearis libri Job,* and *Commentariolum in Job* (the *Expositio* preserved in four different recensions, one of the latest of which was supervised probably by the venerable Bede, found in Vallarsi, *Opp. B. Hieron.* Ed. 2, T. III., Append. p. 895 seq.; the *Commentariolum* in the same work, T. V., App. p. 1013 seq.; (comp. Bedæ *Opp.* ed. Basil. 3, col. 602 s.); Albertus Magnus: *Postillæ super Job* (not printed as yet): Thomas Aquinas: *Expositio aurea in l. Job,* T. XV., *Opp.* (ed. Paris, 1660), Nicolas de Lyra (Lyranus) in the *Postillæ in universa Biblia* (written 1292–1330), first printed at Rome 1471, 5 voll. fol.; Gregory Barhebræus: *Scholia in libr. Jobi* (ed. G. H. Bernstein, Vratislav. 1858, fol.).

B. Jewish Commentators.—R. Saadia Gaon (about 920), an Arabic translation with comments, contained in Isr. Schwarz: *Tikwath Enosh, i. e., Liber Jobi,* Tom. II. (Berol., 1868); Rashi (R. Solomon Isaaki of Troyes, † 1105), who left behind him an unfinished Comment. on Job, which his grandson, R. Samuel ben Meïr (Nashbam, † 1160) finished; Aben Ezra, of Toledo († about 1170) wrote in Rome towards the end of his life a Commy. on Job, which may be found in the larger Rabbinical commentaries; where may also be found the commentaries of Moses ben Nachman, or Nachmanides (Ramban, born at Gerona, 1194); of Levi b. Gerson, or Gersonides (Ralbag, born at Bagnols, 1288), and of Abraham Farisol of Avignon,—which, particularly the first two, follow a strongly indicated philosophical bias. Compilations in the nature of *catenæ* have proceeded from R. Shimeon ha Darshan (the *Yalkut Shimeoni,* including all the books of the Old Testament), R. Machir b. Todros (*Yalkut Mechiri,* embracing the three poetic books Tehillim, Mishle, and Job), R. Menahem b. Chelbo, R. Joseph Kara, and R. Parchon. The catenæ of the last-named three have not as yet been published. Much pertaining to the subject is contained in the work of Israël Schwarz, already mentioned, *Tikwath Enosh,* the first part of which contains, besides a critical revision of the Masoretic text, with a new German metrical translation, two further divisions, to wit: (1) *Mekor Israel, i. e., omnes de Ijobi explicationes et deductiones quæ in utroque Talmude Midraschiisque libris et Soharo inveniuntur;* (2) *Commentarios a* R. Jesaia de Trani, R. Moses, *et* R. Joseph Kimchi, *et* R. Serachia ben Isaac Barceloniensis. The second part contains the Arabic translations of the book of Job by R. Saadia Gaon Alfajumi and R. Moses Gekatilia in a Hebrew version, along with a Hebr. Commentary. Comp. also the work which has just appeared: *Translationes antiquæ Arabicæ Libri Jobi quæ supersunt, ex apographo codicis musei Britannici nunc primum edidit atque illustravit* Wolf Guil. Frid. Comes de Baudissin, Lips., 1870.

II. PERIOD: THE REFORMATION AND THE AGE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING (1517—1750).

A. *Protestant Commentators.*—1. *Lutheran:* Joh. Brentius: *Annotationes in Job.* Halæ Suevor., 1546, and *Opp. omn.* Tübing., 1578, T. III., p. 1 seq. (the best and fullest of these older Lutheran commentaries; comp. Hartmann, *Brenz,* p. 129, 284);—Hieronymus Weller: *Auslegung des Büchlein Hiob,* T. II., *Opp.* Lips., 1703 (embracing only the first twelve chapters, but thoroughly learned and edifying—comp. Nobbe: *D. Hieron. Weller von Molsdorf, der Freund und Schüler Luther's,* Leipzig, 1870);—Victorin Strigel, *Liber Jobi ad Ebraicam veritatem recognitus et argumentis atque scholiis illustratus,* Lips. 1566, 1571;—Abrah. Calov.: *Biblia V. et N. Testamenti illustrata,* Francof. 1672 seq., Tom. II.;—Sebast. Schmid: *Com-*

mentar in Job, Argentor, 1670, 1705, 2 vols.;—Joh. Heinr. Michaelis: *Uberiores annotationes in Hagiographos V. T. libros*, Hal. 1720, T. I.—Kortüm: *Das Buch Hiob übers. mit Anmerk.*, Leipzig, 1708.

2. *Reformed:* Joh. Œcolampadius: *Exegemata in Job et Danielem*, Basil. 1532, and often;—Mart. Bucer: *Commentar. in libr. Job*, Argentor. 1528, fol.;—Huldrich Zwingli: *Randglossen zu Job* (in the Greek Aldine of 1518, annotated throughout by him, edited by Andr. v. Asola);—Joh. Calvin: *Conciones super l. Job*, Genev. 1569, fol.; also in *Opp. Calvini*, Amst. 1671 seq.; Joh. le Mercier (Mercerus): *Comment. in Job, Proverb, Eccles., Cantic.*, 1573, fol.;—Jo. Drusius: *Scholia in l. Job*, Amst. 1636;—Jo. Piscator: *Commentar. in univ. Biblia*, 4 Voll. f., Herborn, 1643 seq.;—Hugo Grotius: *Annotationes in V. T.*, Par. 1644, fol.;—Jo. Cocceius: *Camment. in l. Job*, in *Opp.* Vol. I., Amst. 1675;—Jo. Clericus [Le Clerc]: *Comm. in Hagiographos V. T. libros*, Amst. 1731, fol.;—Alb. Schultens: *Animadversiones philologicæ in Job, etc.*, Traj. ad Rhen. 1708 (also in *Opp. min.* Ludg. Bat. 1769); by the same author: *Liber Jobi c. nova vers. et comm. perpetuo*, Lugd. Bat. 1737, 2 Voll. 4to (comp. the abridgment of it—*A. Schultens' Comm. in Job in compend. redeg., etc.*, G. J. L. Vogel, T. I., II., Hal. 1773, '74);—Dav. Renat. Bouillier: *Observationes miscellaneæ in libr. Job, quibus versionibus et interpretibus passim epicrisis instituitur, etc.*, Amst. 1758.

B. *Catholic Commentators.*—Joh. Maldonatus, S. J. († 1583): *Commentarii in præcipuos S. Scripturæ libros Vet. Testamenti*, Paris, 1643 fol.;—Casp. Sanctius, S. J. († 1626): *In l. Job Commentarii c. paraphr.* Lugd. Bat. 1625, fol.;—Joach. de Pineda (S. J., † 1637): *Commentariorum in l. Job libri* XIII., 2 Voll., Madr. 1597, 1601, f.;—Balthas. Corderius, S. J. († 1650): *Jobus elucidatus*, Antverp. 1646, '56, f.;—Antonio de Escobar, S. J. († 1669): *Commentarius in Biblia*, Tom. IV.;—Bolducius (Bolduc. Capuchin); *Commentar in Job.*, 2 Voll., Paris, 1631, 1638;—Fr. Vavassor, S. J. († 1681): *Jobus commentario et metaphrasi illustratus*, Paris, 1679;—Augustin Calmet: *Commentaire littéral sur tous les livres de l'ancien et nouveau Testament*, Paris, 1707 sqq., 22 Voll., 4to. (Lat. Ed. by Dom. Mansi, Lucca, 1730 seq.).

III. THE MODERN PERIOD SINCE 1750.

1. The period during which rationalism prevailed (1750—1820).*—Goële: *Observationes miscellaneæ in lib. Job*, Amstel. 1758;—Joh. Fr. Bardt: *Paraphrast Erklärung des B. Hiob.*, 2 Parts, Leipzig, 1764;—J. J. Baur: *Animadversiones ad quædam loca Jobi*, Tubing. 1781;—Eckermann: *Versuch einer neuen poetischen Uebersetzung des B. Hiob, etc.*, Lübeck, 1778;—Sander: *Das Buch Hiob Erklärt*, Leipzig, 1780;—Moldenhauer: *D. B. Hiob übersetzt und erklärt*, 2 Parts, Leipzig, 1780, 1781;—J. D. Dathe: *Job, Proverb, Salom, Eccl., Cantic. Cant. lat. versi notisque philol. et criticis illustr.*, Hal. Sax. 1789;—J. Chr. F. Schulz: *Scholia in V. Test.*, (Tom. VI., ed. G. Lor. Bauer), Norimb. 1796;—H. A. Schultens and H. Muntinghe: *Das Buch Hiob übersetzt und erklärt. Aus den Holländischen mit Zusätzen und Anmerkungen J. P. Berg's von K. F. Weidenbach*, Leipzig, 1797; C. Rosenmüller: *Scholia in Vet. Test.*, Tom. V., *Jobus, lat. vert. et perpet. annotat. instr.*, Lips. 1806; ed. 2, 1824;—† Theod. Dereser in Dom. v. Brentano's *Bibelwerk: Die heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, Frankfürt a. M. 1797 seq.;—Stuhlmann: *Hiob*, Hamb. 1804; J. R. Schärer: *Das B. Hiob übersetzt und erklärt*, 2 Thle. Bern, 1818;—W. Mössler: *Das Buch Hiob erklärt*, Neustadt, 1823;—E. G. A. Böckel: *Das B. Hiob, für gebildete Leser bearbeitet*, Berl. 1821; 2 *umgearb. Auflage* 1830;—L. F. Melsheimer: *Das B. Hiob aus dem Hebr. metrisch übersetzt und durch kurze, philologische Anmerk. erläutert*, Mannheim, 1823.

2. The period of a more profound perception of the history of redemption and of theological truth (1820—1870).

K. Umbreit: *Das Buch Hiob: Uebersetzung und Auslegung, nebst Einleitung über Geist, Form, und Verfasser des Buchs.* Heidelb. 1824, 2d ed., 1832;—F. B. Köster: *Das Buch Hiob und der Prediger Salomonis nach ihrer strophischen Anordnung übersetzt*, Schleswig, 1831;—H. Ewald: *Die poetischen Bücher des Alten Bundes*, 3 Theil. 1836; 2d Ed. (*Die Dichter des Alten Bundes*) 1854;—L. Hirzel: *Hiob* in the *Kurzgefasstes exeget. Hanb. zum Alten Test.*,

* The works indicated by a † proceed from Catholic, those by a * from Jewish, all the rest from evangelical commentators.

1839; 2d Ed. by Just. Olshausen, 1852;—J. G. Stickel: *Das Buch Hiob rhythmisch gegliedert und übersetzt, mit exeget. und krit. Bemerkungen, Leipzig*, 1842;—J. G. Vaihinger: *Das Buch Hiob, der Urschrift gemäss metrisch übersetzt und erläutert, Stuttgart*, 1842; 2d Ed. 1856;—A. Heiligstedt: *Commentarius gramm. hist. crit. in Job* (as Vol. IV., Part I. of Maurer's Comment.) Leipzig, 1847;—† B. Welte: *Das Buch Hiob übersetzt und erklärt*, Frieib. i. Breisg., 1849; H. A. Hahn; *Kommentar über das Buch Hiob*, Berlin, 1850;—Ed. Isid. Magnus; *Philolog.-historischer Kommentar zum Buch Hiob*, 2 Parts, Halle, 1850;—Konst. Schlottmann: *D. B. Hiob verdeutscht und erläutert*, Berlin, 1851;—A. Ebrard: *Das Buch Hiob als poetisches Kunstwerk (in fünffüssigen jamben) übersetzt und erläutert*, Landau, 1858;—Franz Delitzsch: *Bibl. Kommentar über die poetische Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 2d Vol. *Das Buch Hiob; mit Beiträgen von Prof. Fleischer und Konsul Wetzstein*, Leipzig, 1864; [translated into English by Rev. F. Bolton, B. A., and published in Clark's Foreign Theol. Library, 2 Vols., Edinb., 1869];—Ad. Kamphausen, in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, Div. I. Vol. III., Part 3, 1865;—Fr. Böttcher: *Neue exeget. kritische Aehrenlese zum Alten Testament*, edited by Mühlau, Vol. III., 1865 (comp. the Exeget.-krit. Aehrenlese, 1849);—G. H. G. Jahr: *Die poet. werke der alten Hebräer in neuberichtigter metrischer Uebersetzung. Ein literarisches Lesebuch für Gebildete*, Vol. II., Part I: *Das Buch Hiob, etc.*, Neuwied, 1865;—A. Dillmann: *Hiob*, for the 3d Ed. of the *Kurzgef. exeget. Handb. zum Alten Test. nach Hirzel und Olshausen neu bearbeitet*, Leipzig, 1869;—E. W. Hengstenberg: *Das Buch Hiob erläutert* (*Opus posthumum*), Berlin, 1870-71. [Adalbert Merx: *Das Gedicht von Hiob: Hebräischer Text, kritisch bearbeitet und übersetzt, nebst sach licher und kritischer Einleitung*, Jena. 1871].

English commentaries: Sam. Lee: *The book of the Patriarch Job*, London, 1837; C. P. Carey: *The book of Job translated, explained, and illustrated*, London, 1858;—A Barnes: *Notes, critical, illustrative, and practical, on the book of Job*, 2 Vols., New York, 1852;—A. B. Davidson: *A Commentary, grammatical and exegetical, on the book of Job*, Lond. and Edinb., 1862; [R. Humfry; *The conflict of Job; a paraphrase, etc.*, 1607; Geo. Abbott: *Exposition of the Book of Job*, London, 1640;—Joseph Caryl: *Exposition, with practical observations on the Book of Job*, London, 1648-66;—E. Leigh: *Annotations on Job*, London, 1657;—J. F. Senault: *A paraphrase on the book of Job*, London, 1648; James Durham: *Exposition of the book of Job*, 1659;—Geo. Hutcheson: *An exposition upon Job, being the sum of* 316 *lectures*, Lond., 1669;—R. Blackmore: *A paraphrase on the book of Job*, London, 1700;—Z. Isham: *Divine Philosophy; containing the books of Job, Proverbs and Wisdom, with explanatory notes*, London, 1706;—T. Fenton: *Annotations on the book of Job, and the Psalms*, London, 1732;—S. Wesley: *Dissertationes in librum Jobi*, London, 1736;—R. Grey: *Liber Jobi in versiculos metrice divisus, cum vers. Lat. A. Schult., etc.*, London, 1742;—L. Chappelow: *A commentary on the Book of Job, in which is inserted the Heb. text and English translation, with a Paraphrase, etc.*, Cambridge, 1752;—T. Heath: *An essay towards a new English version of the Book of Job, from the original Hebrew, with a commentary, etc.;* Thomas Scott: *The Book of Job in English verse, translated from the original Hebrew, with remarks, historical, critical and explanatory*, London, 1771;—C. Garden: *An improved version attempted of the Book of Job, with a preliminary dissertation and notes, critical and explanatory*, London, 1796;—Stock (Bp.): *The Book of Job metrically arranged according to the Masora, and newly translated into English; with notes, critical and explanatory*, Bath, 1805;—Elizabeth Smith: *The Book of Job, translated from the Hebrew, with a preface and annotations*, by F. Randolph, D. D., London, 1870;—J. M. Good: *The Book of Job, literally translated, etc., with notes critical and illustrative, and an introductory dissertation*, London, 1812;—John Fry: *A new translation and exposition of the very ancient Book of Job, with notes explanatory and philological*, London, 1827;—G. R. Noyes: *A new translation of the Book of Job, with an Introduction and Notes, etc.*, Cambridge, 1827, 2d Ed., Boston, 1838;—T. Wemyss: *Job, and his Times, or a picture of the patriarchal age, etc., and a New Version, accompanied with Notes and Dissertations*, London, 1839;—A. Tattam: *Book of Job the Just in Coptic, with an English translation*, 1846;—A. Jenour: *Translation of the Book of Job*, Lond., 1841;—T. J. Conant: *The Book of Job, the common Eng. Vers., the Heb. text, and the revised version of the Amer. Bib. Union, with an Introduction and philological Notes*, New York, 1857;—Chr. Wordsworth: *The Book of Job, with Notes and Introduction*,

London, 1867, being Vol. IV. of *The Holy Bible, with notes, etc.;*—J. M. Rodwell: *The Book of Job translated from the Hebrew*, London, 1864;—H. H. Bernard: *The Book of Job*, edited by F. Chance, Vol. I., London, 1864;—* A. Elzas: *The Book of Job, translated, etc., with an Introd. and Notes, etc.*, London, 1872;—also the commy. of Canon Cook in the Bible (or *Speaker's Commentary*), New York, 1874].

French Commentaries: Ernest Renan: *Le livre de Job, traduit de l' Hébreu, avec une Etude, etc.*, Paris, 1859.*

Jewish Commentaries: * Arnheim: *Das Buch Hiob*, 1836;—* J. Wolfsohn, *Das Buch Hiob*, 1843;—* Mor. Lowenthal: *Hiob, Praktische Philosophie oder Darstellung der im Buch Hiob obwaltenden Ideen, nebst Uebersetzung und Kommentar*, Frankfurt a. M. 1846;—Isr. Schwarz: *Tikwath Enosh*—see above I., B.

Expositions for practical edification: The *Bibelwerke* of Starcke, Joachim Lange, of Berleburg, of Fischer and Wohlfarth, O. v. Gerlach, Dächsel, [to which add here the English general commentaries of Patrick, Scott, Henry, Gill, Clarke, *etc.*], the *Calwer Handbuch* for the exposition of the Bible; the translations (with brief expository notes) of Böckel (see above), Gerh. Lange (1831), Justi (1840), Haupt (1847), Hosse (1849), Spiess (1852), Hayd (1859), Berkholz (1859), Jahr (see above), and others. Also J. Diedrich: *Das Buch Job kurz erklärt für heilsbegierige aufmerksame Bibelleser*, 1858;—F. W. S. Schwarz: *Das B. Hiob, ein Kreuz—und Trost-Buch*, Bremen, 1868,—Herm. Victor Andreä: *Hiob. Klassisches Gedicht der Hebräer. Aus dem Grundtext nen übersetzt uud mit Anmerkungen zum tieferen Verständniss versehen*, Barmen, 1870. Comp. also the Essay of A. F. C. Vilmar (in his *Pastoral.-theolog. Blättern*, 1866, Vol. XI., p. 57 seq.): *Wie soll das Buch Hiob praktisch-erbaulich behandelt werden?* [To the general English commentaries mentioned above may be added here, for practical uses, the particular commentaries of Caryl (of which besides the larger work, which is rare, there is an abridgement published in Edinb., 1836), Barnes and Wordsworth, mentioned above. Also the following:—Francis Quarles: *Job militant, with meditations, divine and moral*, 1624;—A. B. Evans: *Lectures on the Book of Job*, London, 1856;—W. H. Green: *The Book of Job*, New York, 1874].

MONOGRAPHS.

a. **Introductory and Critical.**—Fr. Spanheim: *Historia Jobi. sive de obscur. hist. commentat.*, Lugd. Bat. 1672;—C. Zeyss: *Exegetische Einleitung in Hiob*, edited by J. Rambach, Züllich, 1831;—Garnett: *A dissertation on the Book of Job, etc.*, ed. 2, 1751;—Stuss: *De Epopœia Jobæa commentt.* III., Goth. 1753;—Lichtenstein: *Num lib. Job cum Odyssea Homeri comparari possit?* Helmst. 1773;—D. Ilgen: *Jobi antiquissimi carminis Hebr. natura et virtus*, Lips. 1789;—J. Bellermann: *Ueber den kunstvollen Plan im Buch Hiob*, 1813;—Bernstein: *Ueber das Alter, den Inhalt, den Zweck und die gegenwärtige Beschaffenheit des B. Hiob*, in Keil and Tzschirner's *Analekten, etc.*, I. 3, 1813;—J. F. Krause: *Lectionum versionis Alexandrinæ Jobi nondum satis examinaturam specimen*, Regiomont. 1811;—Krehl: *Observationes ad interpretes Græcos et Latinos vet. libr. Job*, I., Lips. 1834;—M. Sachs; *Zur Charakteristik und Erläuterung des Buches Job*, in *Theol. Studd. und Kritt.*, 1834, IV.;—A. Knobel: *De carminis Jobi argumento, fine, ac dispositione*, 1835;—*Dav. Friedländer: *Ueber die Idee des B. Hiob, und die Zeit der Abfassung desselben*, 1845;—W. Gleiss: *Beiträge* zur Kritik des Buches Hiob, 1845;—H. Hupfeld: *Commentatio in quosdam Jobeidos locos*, 1853 (also in the *Deut. Zeitschrift fur christl. Wissensch., etc.*, 1850, No. 35 seq.);—Hengstenberg: *Das Buch Hiob, ein Vortrag.*, 1856;—G. Baur: *Das Buch Hiob und Dante's göttl. Komödie, eine Parallele* in *Studd. und Kritt.* 1856, III.;—Schneider: *Neueste Studien über das B. Hiob*, in the *Deutsche Zeitschr. f. christl. Wissensch., etc.*, 1859, No. 27 seq.;—Fries: *Ueber den grundlegenden Theil des Buches Hiob*, in the *Jahrbucher fur deutsche Theol.*, 1859, IV.;—Räbiger: *De libri Jobi sententia primari*, Vratisl. 1860;—Simson: *Zur Kritik das B. Hiob*, 1861;—Seinecke: *Der Grundgedanke des Buches Hiob*, 1863;—Herm. Schulz: *Zu den kirchlichen Fragen der Gegenwart*, No. 3: *Das Buch Hiob in seiner Bedeutung* fur unsre Zeit,

* Comp. the sharp criticism of this work by the Abbe Crelier: *Le livre de Job vengé des interpretationes fausses et impies de M. Ernest Renan*, Paris, 1860.

Frankfurt, 1869;—E. Reuss: *Das Buch Hiob, ein Vortrag.*, Strassburg, 1869;—W. Volck: *De summa carminis Jobi sententia*, Dorpat, 1870; B. Schmitz: *Der Ideengang des B. Hiob* (*Greifswalder Gymnasial-programm*), 1870.

b. **Exegetical.**—Abr. Hinckelmann: *Jobi theologia evangelica*, Hamb. 1687;—J. W. Baier: *Systema mundi Jobæum* (ex. cap. 26), 1707;—J. W. Baier: *Behemoth et Leviathan ex Job* XL., XLI., *etc.*, Altdorf, 1708;—*Erläuterung einiger Stellen des Hiob*, Herborn, 1713;—T. Hasäus: *De Leviathan Jobi et Jonæ*, Bremen, 1723; C. Scheuchzer: *Jobi Physica Sacra, oder Hiobs Naturwissenschaft verglichen mit der heutigen*, Zürich, 1721;—Winter: *De Behemoth*, Havn. 1722;—J. J. Reiske: *Conjecturæ in Jobum et Proverbia*, Lips. 1779;—K. C. R. Eckermann: *Animadversiones in librum Job*, Lubec. 1779;—*Exegetische und kritische Versuche über die schwersten Stellen des B. Hiob.* I. 1, Leipzig, 1801;—J. H. F. v. Autenrieth: *Ueber das Buch Hiob*, Tübingen, 1823;—T. Fockens: *Pulchra Jobeidos loca commentata.* Amstel. 1844;—C. W. G. Köstlin: *De immortalitatis spe, quæ in l. Jobi apparere dicitur*, 1846;—F. Bottcher: *Æhrenlese und Neue Æhrenlese* (see above);—R. Rüetschi: *Exegetische Bemerkungen Zum Buch Hiob, mit bes. Rücksicht auf Delitzsch Kommentar, in Studd. und Kritt.* 1867, I.—For the special literature on ch. xix. 25 27 (the passage respecting the Goel) see below in the history of the exposition of this section (Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks on ch. xix., No. 1). [The more important English monographs, articles, dissertations, *etc.*, on the book and its contents are the following: John Campbell: *Of the history of Job, reflections on the philosophy and religion of those times, etc.*, in *Hist. of the Bible*, I. 145;—Wm. Warburton (Bp.): *The Divine Legation of Moses demonstrated*, Book VI., Sect. II.; in Works Vol. V., London, 1811;—W. Magee (Abp.): *Discourses and Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrine of Atonement and Sacrifice*, 1801, and Philad. 1825;—W. Hodges: *Elihu; or an Inquiry into the principal scope and design of the Book of Job;* London, 1750;—C. Costard: *Some Observations tending to illustrate the Book of Job, and particularly Job xix.* 25, London, 1747;—C. Peters: *A critical dissertation on the Book of Job* (chiefly in reply to Warburton), London, 1757;—J. Garnett: *A dissertation on the Book of Job, etc.*, London, 1749;—G. Croly: *The Book of Job*, Edinb. 1863; R. Lowth (Bp.): *Lectures on Heb. Poetry* (Lect. XXXII—XXXIV.);—Isaac Taylor: Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, New York, 1861;—Horne's *Introduction to the Holy Scriptures* (4 Vols., Lond. 1863), Vol. II., p. 666 seq.;—J. G. Palfrey: *Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities*, Vol. IV., p. 217 seq., Boston, 1852;—Kitto's *Biblical Cyclopædia*, Art. "Job" by Hengstenberg;—Smith's *Bib. Dictionary*, Hackett & Abbott's Ed. Art. "*Job*" by Canon Cook;—McClintock & Strong's *Cyclopædia*, Art. "Job;" Kitto's *Daily Bib. Illustr. Evening* 1;—Horne's *Introduction to the Holy Scriptures*, Vol. II., p. 666 seq., London, 1863;—G. Croly: *The Book of Job*, Edinb. 1863;—*Princeton Review*, Vol. XXIX., p. 281 seq.;—J. A. Froude: *The Book of Job*, in *Short Studies on Great Subjects;* reprinted from Westminster Review, 1853; *Spirituality of the Book of Job, as exhibited in a Commy. on* chap. xiv., *etc.;* Art. by T. Lewis in *Bib. Sacra*, Vol. VI., p. 265 seq.;—E. P. Barrowes: *Interpretation of Job* xxviii. in *Bib. Sac.*, Vol. X., p. 264 seq.;—Hirzel's *Introduction*, translated in *Bib. Sac.* VII. 383;—Vaihinger's Art. on *The Date of the Book of Job*, from the *Stud. u. Krit.*, reprinted in *Bibl. Repository*, Third Series, Vol. III., p. 174;—G. B. Bacon: *The Gospel according to Job*, in *New Englander*, Vol. XXI., p. 764 seq.]

Frankfurt, 1869;—E. Böhme: *Das Buch Hiob, ein Vortrag*, Strassburg, 1869;—W. Volck: *De summa carminis Jobi sententia*, Dorpat, 1870; E. Schmidt: *Der Grundgedanke des B. Hiob* (*Gymnasial-programm*), 1870.

3. **Exegetical.**—Abr. Ibn-Esra; ... Hamb. 1857;—J. W. Baier: *Specimen ... Jobaeum* (ex cap. 38), 1707;—J. W. Baier: *Explanatio ... Job XL., XLI.*, Altdorf, 1708;—*Erklärung einiger Stellen des Hiob*, Herborn, 1719;—T. Hasaeus: *De Leviathane Jobi et ceti*, Bremen, 1723; G. Schoellhorn: *Job ... oder Hiobs Naturlehre ...*, Zürich, 1731;—Winter: *De Behemoth*, Havn. 1723;—J. J. Reiske: *Conjecturae in Jobum et Proverbia*, Lips. 1779;—N. C. R. Eckermann: *Anmerkungen zu Hiob 38*, Lübeck, 1779;—*Exegetische und kritische Versuche über die schwierigsten Stellen des B. Hiob* I. 1, Leipzig, 1801;—J. H. F. v. Autenrieth: *Ueber das Buch Hiob*, Tübingen, 1823;—T. Forbes: *Poëtica ...*, Aug. 1844;—C. W. G. ...: *De ...*, 1846;—F. Böttcher: *Exegetisch-kritische Aehrenlese* (see above);—R. Heinrichs: *... zum Buche Hiob*, in *Studien und Kritiken* 1867, I.—For the special literature on ch. xix. 25-27 (the passage respecting the Goel) see below in the history of the exposition of this section (Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks on ch. xix., No. 1).—[The more important English monographs, articles, dissertations, etc., on the book and its contents are the following: John Campbell, *Of the Book of Job, reflections on the Wisdom and reasons of Providence*, etc., in *Works*, 1750;—Wm. Warburton: *The Divine Legation of Moses*, Book VI. Sect. II.; in *Works*, Vol. VI., London, 1811;—W. Magee: *Notes on the Book of Job*, in *Dissertations on the Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice*, Dubl. and Bristol 1832;—W. Hodges: *Elihu, or an Enquiry into the principal scope and design of the Book of Job*, London, 1750;—G. Costard: *Some Observations tending to illustrate the Book of Job, and particularly the words, I know that my Redeemer liveth*, London, 1747;—J. Garnett: *A critical dissertation on the Book of Job*, London, 1749;—*The Poetry of Job*, *Eclectic Rev.* ... XXXIV.;—Isaac Taylor: *Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, New York, 1861;—*Book of Job* ... in *Kitto's Biblical Cyclopædia*, Art. "Job" by Hengstenberg;—Smith's *Bib. Dictionary*, Art. "Job" by Canon Cook;—M'Clintock & Strong's *Cyclopædia*, Art. "Job";—Kitto's *Daily Bib. Illustr.*, Evening 1;—Horne's *Introduction to the Holy Scriptures*, Vol. II. p. 666 seq., London, 1863;—C. Craig: *The Book of Job*, Edinb. 1861;—*Princeton Review*, Vol. XXIX. p. 281 seq.;—J. A. Froude: *The Book of Job*, in *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, reprinted from *Westminster Review* 1853;—T. Lewis in *Bib. Sacra*, Vol. VI. p. 36 seq.;—*Interpretation of Job xxviii.* in *Bib. Sacra*, Vol. X. p. 224 seq.;—Hirzel's *Introduction*, translated in *Bib. Sac.* VII. 658;—Art. on *The Date of the Book of Job*, reprinted in ... Third Series, Vol. II., p. 174;—G. B. Bacon: *The Gospel according to Job*, in *New Englander*, Vol. XXI., p. 764 seq.]

THE BOOK OF JOB.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

PROLOGUE.

CHAPS. I. 1–22—II. 1–13.

1. *Job's Character and Course of Life.* (Chap. I. 1–15.)

1 There was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job; and that man was
2 perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil. And there were
3 born to him seven sons and three daughters. His substance also was seven thousand
sheep, and three thousand camels, and five hundred yoke of oxen, and five hundred
she asses, and a very great household; so that this man was the greatest of all the
4 men [sons] of the East.—And his sons went and feasted in their houses, every one
his day [Now his sons were wont to hold a feast at the house of each one on his
(birth)-day], and [they] sent and called for their three sisters to eat and to drink
5 with them. And it was so, when the days of their feasting were gone about, that
Job sent and sanctified them [that he might make atonement for them, Z.], and
rose up early in the morning, and offered burnt offerings according to the number
of them all: for Job said, It may be that my sons have sinned, and cursed, [renounced, bid farewell to] God in their hearts!—Thus did Job continually.

2. *The Divine Determination to try Job through Suffering.*

a. The milder form of trial by taking away his possessions.

(CHAP. I. 6–22.)

6 Now there was a day [it came to pass on a day, or, on the day] when the sons
of God came to present themselves before the Lord [Jehovah], and Satan came also
7 among them. And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan
answered the Lord, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking
8 up and down in it. And the Lord said unto Satan, Hast thou considered my ser-
vant Job, that [for] there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright
9 man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil?—Then Satan answered the Lord,
10 and said, Doth Job fear God for nought? Hast thou not made an hedge about
him, and about his house, and about all that he hath on every side? Thou hast
blessed the work of his hands, and his substance is increased [spread abroad] in
11 the land. But put forth Thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and [verily]
12 he will curse Thee to Thy face. And the Lord said unto Satan, Behold, all that
he hath is in thy power [hand], only upon himself put not forth thine hand. So
Satan went forth from the presence of the Lord.

13 And there was a day [it came to pass on the day], when his sons and his daugh-
14 ters were eating and drinking wine in their eldest brother's house: and there came
a messenger unto Job, and said, The oxen were ploughing, and the [she] asses feed-
15 ing beside them: and the Sabeans fell upon them, and took them away; yea, they
have slain [smitten] the servants with the edge of the sword; and I only am escaped

16 alone to tell thee. While he was yet speaking, there came also another, and said,
The fire of God is fallen from heaven, and hath burned up the sheep and the ser-
17 vants, and consumed them; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee. While he
was yet speaking there came also another, and said, The Chaldeans made out three
bands, and fell upon the camels, and have carried them away, yea, and slain the
servants with the edge of the sword: and I only am escaped alone to tell thee.
18 While he was yet speaking there came also another, and said, Thy sons and thy
19 daughters were eating and drinking wine in their eldest brother's house: and be-
hold, there came a great wind from [beyond] the wilderness, and smote the four
corners of the house, and it fell upon the young men [people], and they are dead;
and I only am escaped alone to tell thee.
20 Then Job arose, and rent his mantle, and shaved his head, and fell down upon
21 the ground, and worshipped, and said: Naked came I out of my mother's womb,
and naked shall I return thither: The Lord [Jehovah] gave, and the Lord [Jeho-
22 vah] hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord [Jehovah]. In all this
Job sinned not, nor charged God foolishly [nor uttered folly against God].

b. The severer trial, the loss of health.

(CHAP. II. 1–10).

1 Again there was a day [and it came to pass on a day (Z.), or: Now it was the
day] when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord and Satan
2 also came among them to present himself before the Lord. And the Lord said
unto Satan, From whence comest thou? And Satan answered the Lord, and said,
3 From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it. And
the Lord said unto Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job, that [for] there
is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God
and escheweth evil? and still he holdeth fast his integrity, although thou movedst
4 Me against him to destroy him without cause. And Satan answered the Lord and
5 said, Skin for skin, yea [and] all that a man hath will he give for his life. But
put forth Thine hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will curse Thee
6 to Thy face. And the Lord said unto Satan, Behold he is in thine hand; but
7 [only] spare his life. So Satan went forth from the presence of the Lord, and smote
8 Job with sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown. And he took him a
9 potsherd to scrape himself withal; and he sat down among the ashes. Then said
his wife unto him, Dost thou still retain thine integrity. Curse [renounce] God,
10 and die! But he said unto her, Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speak-
eth. What! shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive
evil? In all this did not Job sin with his lips.

3. *The Visit of the Friends and their Mute Sympathy as an Immediate Preparation for the Action of the Poem.*

VERS. 11–13.

11 Now when [or, Then] Job's three friends heard of all this evil that was come
upon him, [and] they came every one from his own place; Eliphaz the Temanite,
and Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite; for [and] they had made
an appointment together to come [or: they met together by appointment] to mourn
12 with him, and to comfort him. And when they lifted up their eyes afar off, and
knew him not, they lifted up their voice and wept; and they rent every one
13 his mantle, and sprinkled dust upon their heads toward heaven. So they sat down
with him upon the ground seven days and seven nights, and none spake a word
unto him: for they saw that his grief [affliction] was very great.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. *Job's character and course of life.* Ch. i. 1-15.

Ver. 1. **There was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job.** Literally, A man was in the land of Uz, *etc.*: the order of the words as in 2 Sam. xii. 1; Esth. ii. 5. On the name אִיּוֹב see Introduction, § 1, and Note.—בְּאֶרֶץ עוּץ, Vulg.: in terra Hus; LXX.: *ἐν χώρᾳ τῇ Ἀυσίτιδι*. Comp. the more precise definition: *ἐν τῇ Ἀυσίτιδι ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁρίοις τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ Ἀραβίας* (in the addition at the end of

the book) which gives with general accuracy the position of the country. For we are certainly constrained to place it in the region lying North-East of Edomitis towards the Arabian desert. We cannot identify it with any locality within the land of the Edomites, nor with that land itself, as some writers, ancient and modern, have undertaken to do. For 1. In ver. 3 Job is represented in general terms as belonging to the בְּנֵי קֶדֶם, the "sons of the East," *i. e.*, as a North Arabian, an inhabitant of the Syro-Arabian desert which extends eastward from Transjordanic Palestine to the Euphrates (comp. 1 Kings v. 10 [A. V.: iv. 30] Isai. xi. 14; Jerem. xlix. 28; Ezek. xxv. 4).—2. The Sabeans and Chaldeans are, according to vers. 15 and 17, neighbors, dwelling in adjacent territory.—3. The *Αἰσῖται* (*Αἰσεῖται*) mentioned by Ptolemy V., xix. 2, as neighbors of Babylonia on the West, under the Caucabenes, are assuredly none other than the inhabitants of the country we are considering.—4. Jerem. xxv. 20 sq., clearly and definitely distinguishes between Uz and Edom. The expression in Lam. iv. 21, "O daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Uz," does not affirm the identity of the two countries, but rather refers to an expansion of the boundaries of Edom which at some time took place, so as to include the land of Uz (comp. Nägelsbach on both the passages cited).—5. In Gen. x. 23, Uz, the patriarchal founder of the country, after whom it was named, appears as the immediate descendant of Aram; in Gen. xxii. 21, as the son of Nahor, the brother of Abraham; and in Gen. xxxvi. 28 as the grand-son of Seïr, the ancestor of the Horite aborigines of Idumea. None of these passages in Genesis brings Uz into genealogical relation to Edom, though they clearly make him appear as geographically his neighbor.—6. Again ch. ii. 11 of our book (Eliphaz the Temanite), also ch. xxxii. 2 (Elihu the descendant of Buz; comp. Gen. xxii. 21, where the same Buz appears as the son of Nahor and the brother of Uz) argue for a relation of co-ordination between the countries of Uz and Edom.—7. Josephus (Ant. I., 6, 4) names *Οὖσος*, the son of Aram (Gen. x. 23) as the founder of Trachonitis and Damascus. This reference, resting as it does on a primitive tradition, contains an indirect contradiction of the supposition that Uz was an Idumean province; rather is the inference probable that at one time it extended further North, as far as South-eastern Syria.—8. The Syro-Arabian tradition of the Middle Ages and of modern times fixes the place where Job lived at a considerable distance North, or North-East from Seïr-Edom, to wit, in the fruitful East-Hauranitic province el-Bethenije (Nukra), which Abulfeda calls "a part of the territory of Damascus," and within which at this day are pointed out a "Place of Job" (Makam-Ejûb) and a Monastery of Job (Dair-Ejûb), both situated south of Nawa on the road leading north to Damascus (comp. Fries in the *Stud. und Krit.*, 1854, II.; and especially J. C. Wetstein: "The Monastery of Job in Hauran, and the Tradition of Job," in the Appendix to Delitzsch's Commentary, II. 395 sq., Clark, Edinb.). We are indeed scarcely to look for the home of our hero so far North as these sacred localities of the Christian-Mohamedan tradition concerning Job, or as the location favored by the hypothesis of Bochart, Ilgen, J. H. Michaelis, *etc.*, which regards the valley al-Gutha situated not far from Damascus, as the Uz of Scripture. At the same time the considerations here presented make it far more probable that it belonged to the territory of East-Hauran (not necessarily of Hauran in Palestine, or the eastern portion of Manasseh), than that it was identical with any locality in Edom South, or South-West from Palestine. ["The so-called universalism of the writer is apparent here. His hero is a stranger to Judaism and the privileges of the peculiar people, living in a foreign country. The author saw that God was not confined to the Jew, but was and must be everywhere the father of His children, however imperfectly they attained to the knowledge of Him; he saw that the human heart was the same, too, everywhere, that it everywhere proposed to itself the same problems, and rocked and tossed amidst the same uncertainties; that its intercourse with heaven was alike, and alike awful in all places; and away down far in that great desert stretching into infinite expanse, where men's hearts drew in from the imposing silence, deep, still thoughts of God, he lays the scene of his great poem. He knows, Jew though he be, that there is something deeper far than Judaism, or the mere outward forms of any dispensation, that God and man are the great facts, and the great problem their connection." Davidson]. **And that man was perfect and upright, and one that feared God and eschewed evil.** These four attributes, of which תָּם (literally *integer*, whole, complete) here denotes moral integrity, and hence blamelessness, while יָשָׁר denotes uprightness, righteousness,—are not simply co-ordinate, but "the first furnishes the foundation of the second, and the last two conjointly of the first two," (Hahn). For the fear of God and eschewing evil are obviously mentioned as the ground or source of blamelessness and uprightness (comp. Prov. i. 7); the religious characteristics serve to explain the moral. The ו before יְרֵא is thus explanatory, and might, as in ver. 8 and chap. ii. 3, be dispensed with. [Lee remarks well on תָּם that it "seems to be synonymous with the Greek *τέλειος*, 1 Cor. ii. 6; xiv. 20, *etc.*, and to signify *complete* in every requisite of true religion, 'thoroughly furnished unto all good works,' rather than *perfect* in the abstract; and hence תֻּמָּה ch. ii. 3 is rather the exercise of true religion, than perfection or integrity in the abstract." Delitzsch defines thus: "תָּם, with the whole heart disposed towards God and what is good, and also well-disposed toward mankind; יָשָׁר in thought and action without deviation conformed to that which is right, יְרֵא אֱלֹהִים, fearing God, and consequently being actuated by the fear of God which is the beginning (*i. e.*, principle) of wisdom; סָר מֵרָע, keeping aloof from evil, which is opposed to God." Ewald and Davidson cor-relate תָּם and יְרֵא אֱלֹהִים, as descriptive of the inner qualities of a righteous

man, יָשָׁר and סָר מֵרָע as descriptive of his outer life].

Ver. 2. **And there were born to him seven sons and three daughters.** The description of his piety is immediately followed by that of his prosperity, showing first of all how he prospered in his family, how rich he was in children. The high significance which attached to this species of wealth and happiness, according to the Old Testament view, may be seen from ch. xxi. 8, 11; xxix. 5, of our book, and also Ps. cxxvii., cxxviii. The number of sons, it will be observed, far exceeds that of daughters; this being in accordance with the tendency, prevalent alike in ancient and in modern times, to magnify the importance of those by whom the family life and name are perpetuated, and to regard that man as specially fortunate, who is blessed with a preponderance of male descendants (comp. Prov. xvii. 6). The number of sons, moreover, and the number of daughters, are sacred numbers of special symbolical significance, their sum likewise forming a sacred number; and again, in the summary which follows of the patriarch's possessions, we find the same numbers recurring, as multiples of one thousand. It has already been shown in the Introduction, § 8, near the beginning, how in these unmistakably ideal numerals we recognize, notwithstanding the prose form, the essentially poetic character of the Prologue; and the same is true of the Epilogue (see ch. xlii. 12, 13).

Ver. 3. **His substance also was seven thousand sheep and three thousand camels,** *etc.* [" It is a large, princely household." Del.] " Although Job is not to be regarded as a wandering Bedouin, but as a settled prince, or Emir (ch. i. 4, 18; xxix. 7; xxxi. 32), who also engaged in agriculture (ch. i. 14; v. 23; xxxi. 8, 38 sq.), his wealth is nevertheless, after the manner of those countries, estimated according to the extent of his flocks and herds (מִקְנֶה), together with the servants thereto appertaining." Dillm.—**Five hundred yoke of oxen, and five hundred she asses.** צֶמֶד, a yoke, *i. e.*, pair, oxen being worked in pairs in tilling the land (ver. 14). Only the she asses are mentioned (comp. on the other hand Gen. xii. 16; xxxii. 15), as forming the most valuable part of this species of cattle property. In Syria even yet they are far more numerously owned than the males, and sold at three times the value of the latter; and this not so much for the milk as for breeding (comp. Wetzstein in Delitzsch; also Rosenmüller's *Altes und Neues Morgenland,* III., 319).—**And a very great household** (very many servants). עֲבֻדָּה רַבָּה, precisely as in Gen. xxvi. 14, brought into connection with wealth in cattle, which, as the more important, is mentioned first. The Targ. takes עֲבֻדָּה to be the same with עֲבֹדָה, 1 Chron. xxvii. 26, meaning husbandry. This interpretation, which the Septuagint seeks after its fashion to combine with the common one (*καὶ ὑπηρεσία πολλὴ σφόδρα, καὶ ἔργα μεγάλα ἦν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*), is condemned by the analogy of the parallel passage in Gen. xxvi. 14, as well as by the singular unanimity with which exegetical tradition favors the signification we have given.—**So that this man was the greatest of all the sons of the East.** ["Vav consec. imperf. summing up the issue of the foregone: all which made Job the greatest of the Orientals." Davidson.] On בְּנֵי־קֶדֶם see above on ver. 1, also Introd., § 5. For גָּדוֹל in the sense of rich and distinguished, see Gen. xxiv. 35; xxvi. 13; Eccles. ii. 9. [" The sons of the East are the inhabitants of the regions East of Palestine. Although elsewhere the term designates the Arabians, who constitute the principal element of the population between Canaan and the Euphrates, here it cannot be referred specially to them, for Job was not an Arabian, and Uz belonged rather to the Aramaic race." Hengst. Schlottmann calls attention to the fact that the name "Saracen" is Arabic for "men of the East." E.]

Vers. 4, 5 describe and illustrate Job's remarkable piety, presenting a single characteristic of the same, which at the same time prepares the way for a better understanding of the narrative which follows. [These verses serve a threefold use in the narrative: primarily, they furnish the historical occasion for the terrible calamities which follow; incidentally, they contain a striking illustration of Job's tender and conscientious piety; and, finally, they present a pleasing picture of patriarchal family life in its affectionate harmony and joyousness.—E.]

Ver. 4. **Now his sons were wont to hold a feast in the house of each one on his birth-day.**—Lit.: "And his sons went and made a feast," *etc.* The verb " went " here, as the perf. consec. וְהָלְכוּ shows, refers not to an action which took place once, but to one which was wont to recur at definite times. [" It does not exhibit the whole religious expression of Job's life, but only one remarkable custom in it; hence being independent, *vav* has not the imperf. consecutive, but the simple perf., expressing here a single past action which the connection shows to have been customary." Dav.] Since מִשְׁתֶּה denotes not the ordinary daily meal, but, as the derivation from שתה proves, a feast of entertainment, a banquet attended with wine-drinking (ver. 13), a *συμπόσιον, convivium,* it is impossible to take יוֹמוֹ (Accus. tempor.) in the sense of a *daily* recurrence of these meals, thus assuming that every week the dinner passed round in rotation to each of the seven brothers (Hirzel, Oehler, Kamph., Del. [Hengstenberg, Words.]). This would be a living in riot and revelry, all the more unbecoming since by such an arrangement the parents would be excluded altogether from the family-circle, whereas the sisters would be, contrary to Eastern custom, the habitual companions of their brothers at the table. Evidently יוֹם denotes a day marked by special observance and feasting (comp. Hos. i. 11; ii. 15; vii. 5); whence it would seem to have been either some annual festival, of general observance, such as the harvest festival, so widely observed in antiquity, or the spring festival (so Ewald, Vaih., Heil., Hahn, Dillm. [Dav.]); or else the birth-day festival of either one of the seven brothers (Rosml., Umbr., Welte, Schlott.

[Wem., Carey, Rod., Bar., Elz.]). The latter seems to be most favored by ch. iii. 1, where יוֹם (as also in Hosea vii. 5) evidently stands in the sense of birth-day (Gen. xl. 20); with this moreover stands in special harmony what we find in vers. 13 and 18, to wit, that special prominence is twice given to the circumstance that Job's calamities came to pass on the day when his *first-born* son was lost; this very coincidence of those fearful visitations with the birth-day festival of his first-born (the רֵאשִׁית אוֹנוֹ, the firstling of his strength, comp. Gen. xlix. 3), constituting for the unfortunate father a tragic climax of sorrow, such as could not have befallen him had any other festivity been the occasion which brought the children together to undergo their common doom. The opening words of the verse following are indeed cited against this view; the fact, it is alleged, that we find mentioned there a cycle of days as "the days of their feasting," and that it was not until they were ended that Job performed his purification, requires, on the assumption that these days were the birth-days of the seven sons, that the cycle should be distributed over the entire year, which would lead us to the untenable conclusion that but one expiation was offered in the year, namely, at the end of the last birth-day festival (comp. Dillm.). But why this conclusion should be pronounced untenable certainly does not appear. Moreover there is nothing at all to prevent our supposing that the birth-days of the seven sons, or indeed of all the ten children, were not very far apart, that, *e. g.*, they all fell within one half-year. And then, over and above all, it would seem that excessively fine-spun speculation as to the question how the author conceived the circulation or the expiration (הִקִּיף) of the festal days must result in some violence to the character of the narrative, which is not rigidly historical, but poetic and ideal. For this reason we must reject Schlottmann's endeavor to represent each of the birth-day festivals mentioned in the account as lasting several days, thus assuming that Job's expiatory sacrifice was made at the close of each such festival. This supposition would make it necessary for us to read quite too much between the lines, to say in ver. 4 that יוֹמוֹ means the first in each series of feast-days, while in ver. 5, by יְמֵי הַמִּשְׁתֶּה are meant the several days of each festival of days (with which, however, the verb הִקִּיף, to go round, *devolvi*, does not agree).

[Zöckler's argument in favor of the birth-day theory is ingenious and suggestive, but not altogether satisfactory. The account in the text is so brief and general as to make absolute certainty impossible. The impression, however, which the narrative most naturally makes on the reader is: (1) That the days of the feast followed each other in immediate succession; in other words, that the seven feasts were given on seven successive days in the houses of the seven brothers in regular order from the oldest to the youngest; and (2) that at the end of the week, probably on the morning of the eighth day, Job's sacrifice was offered. This is the simple and natural deduction from the narrative as it stands, and it is not easy to harmonize with it the theory that the feasts were held on a series of birth-days, separate from each other by an interval, longer or shorter. The suggestion that each birth-day feast lasted several days, and that Job's sacrifice was offered at the end of those days, is clearly shown by Z. to be unwarranted, and at variance with the statement conveyed by the הִקִּיף. We are thus reduced either to (*a*) the daily theory, advocated by Hirzel, *etc.*; or to (*b*) the theory of an annual festival (spring or harvest, or both). But such an interminable carousal as (*a*) would imply, is, as Z. shows, highly improbable, and not to be assumed without the gravest necessity. In favor of (*b*), on the contrary, may be urged: (1) The prevalence in antiquity of those simple season-festivals. (2) The especial probability that such feasts would be observed in a patriarchal community, like Job's family, belonging, as it evidently does, to the period of transition from a pastoral nomadism to a settled agricultural life. (3) The correspondence between the number of Job's sons and the seven days of the festival week. (4) The absence of Job, which would be unnatural if these were birth-day festivals, may be at least more readily accounted for on such an occasion of simple secular merry-making as, *e. g.*, a harvest festival. (Schlottmann well remarks that if the festival had been religious in its character, Job, as patriarchal priest, would have stood more in the foreground).

Z.'s remark that the double mention of the fact that the fatal feast was held in the house of the first-born, becomes doubly significant, if the day were his birth-day, is certainly striking, but of less weight than the other considerations presented above. The *specification* of the place of entertainment imparts greater reality to the narrative; the further specification of the house of the first-born still further deepens the tragic impression of the story, by suggesting that the calamity struck the banqueters on the very first day of their festivities.—E.]—**And sent and called for their three sisters to eat and to drink with them.**—This invitation which was always extended to the sisters (who, we are to suppose, were living with their mother), is made specially prominent as showing "the inner mutual relation which the father had established among his children" (HIRZEL). ["*And they used to send and invite*—an independent fact; the author lifts it out of dependence to emphasize it, for the purpose of showing the beautiful harmony and affection of Job's family one to another, and the generous and free-hearted magnificence of the sons, and also the possibility of the coming catastrophe which swept away sons and daughters at once. The father had no relish for this kind of enjoyment; but no peevish dislike of it, or of those who had, being a wise and liberal man, wishing the happiness of all about him, and pleased to see them enjoy themselves in their own, not his way, so only they do it innocently and religiously. The sons of Job seem to have had establishments of their own, and the daughters lived apart with the mother. On the irregularity of fem. שְׁלֹשֶׁת with fem. noun, comp. Gen. vii. 13; Jer. xxxvi. 23

(where the gend. are both right and wrong); Zech. iii. 9." Dav.]

Ver. 5. **And it was so, when the days of their feasting were gone about,** *i. e.*, when the period through which their mutual invitations ran, that which embraced their frequent birth-day festivals, had run its course (הִקִּיפוּ, comp. that which has been said above against Schlott). [Good: "And it came to pass, as the days of such banquets returned," *etc.*, which is not only opposed to the plain meaning of the verb, but at variance with the obvious design of Job's sacrifice, which was retrospective, not anticipatory, offered for the sins which he feared they *had* committed, not for those which he feared they *might* commit. A similar rotatory system of banquets is said to prevail in China. "They have their fraternities which they call the brotherhood of the months; this consists of months according to the number of the days therein, and in a circle they go abroad to eat at one another's houses by turns." Semedo's *History of China*, quoted by Burder, Oriental Customs.—E.] יְמֵי הַמִּשְׁתֶּה is to be understood collectively, "the days of the banquets, of entertaining" not as a strict singular, of one feast distributed over several days.—**That Job sent that he might atone for them.**—He sent for them for this end; for the efficacy of sacrifices of purification depended on the presence of those in whose behalf they were made. וַיְקַדְּשֵׁם, literally: "and sanctified, consecrated them," defining the object of וישלח. How the sanctification took place, we are told in what follows. The term expresses not merely the preparation for the expiation, the lustration or washing preceding the sacrifice, as Rosmlr., Arnh., Hirz., Vaih., Heil., Dillm. affirm, on the strength of passages like Ex. xix. 10; Josh. vii. 13; 1 Sam. xvi. 5. [Zöckler seems to regard the "sanctification" here as a part of the general rite of expiation which Job performed, and thus as taking place at the same time. The other theory, maintained by the majority of commentators (including, in addition to those named above, Hengst., Dav., Con.), is supported by the following considerations: "(1) The general usage of the verb קדש, the essential signification of which in its transitive forms is to dedicate, purify for holy service. See Ges. and Fürst's *Lex.* (2) The analogy of the Mosaic and other rituals, in which preparatory rites of purification are the rule. It is true that the author of the book is careful to put himself and his characters outside of the Mosaic system,* and avoids even here, as we shall see below, any *identification* of Job's sacrifices with the Mosaic. Preparatory rites, lustrations, and the like, are however common to all religions, and there is no reason to suppose that the author would shrink from introducing a feature of such general observance because it belongs to the Mosaic ritual. It is in harmony with this that we find (3) in Ex. xix. 10 the direct recognition of a preparatory rite of purification (the same word being used there as here), before the Sinaitic code had been given, whereby the prevalence of such a rite in the pre-Mosaic period is clearly implied (comp. Gen. xxxv. 21). (4) The order of terms in the passage under consideration—"sent," "purified," "rose early," "offered"—certainly agrees best with the supposition that on the evening of the seventh day he sent and secured the purification of his children, their preparation for the solemn holocaust of the morrow, and then rose early on the morning of the eighth day, and in presence of his assembled children consummated the sacrifice. Had only one sacrificial rite been designated, the natural order would have been "rose," "sent," "purified," "offered." (5) The absolute use of וישלח makes it exceedingly doubtful whether we can with Z. render it: "and he sent for them." At the same time, as Z. admits, the impressiveness and efficacy of the sacrifice required that those for whom it was made should be present. This leaves us no alternative but to regard the sanctification and the offering as two distinct rites, the former secured by Job's mandate in his absence, the latter performed by him in person, and in the presence of his children. When to this we add the separation of the two verbs "sanctified" and "offered" by the verb "rose early," the conclusion here reached seems irresistible.—E.]—**And rose up early in the morning, and offered burnt-offerings, according to the number of them all.**—The comprehensive magnificence of the sacrifice made it necessary that he should rise early. [His rising early may also be taken as an indication of his zeal, and of his earnest desire to make the expiation as promptly as possible. "Job made his offering in the morning because in the morning the feelings are most freely and most strongly inclined toward religious contemplation. The saying: *Morgenstunde hat Gold im Munde* (the morning hour has gold in its mouth), is true not only of work, but also of prayer." Hengst.—E.] וישכם perf. consec. as in ver. 4. ["הֶעֱלָה refers not so much to bringing it up to the raised altar, as to causing it to rise in flame and smoke, causing to ascend to God who is above." Del.]. מספר כלם, and according to the number of them all (accus. of nearer definition, Ewald, ⸹ 300, c. [Green, ⸹ 274, 2]). Job, it will be observed, offered *burnt-offerings*, not sin-offerings (so again in ch. xlii. 8). This is quite in accordance with the pre-Mosaic patriarchal period, which, as all the historical references to sacrifices in the book of Genesis also show, was not yet acquainted with the sin-offering instituted later by Moses. [An indication of the care and skill with which our author preserves the antique coloring of his narrative.—E.] Another genuinely patriarchal trait is furnished in the fact that Job, in his character as father, appears also in the character of priest of the household, offering its sacrifices. Comp. *Introduction*, ⸹ 2.—**For Job said:** in the first instance, naturally, to himself, or in prayer to God; but surely also in speech to others, as a formal statement of his principles, and explanation of his course. It is a needless weakening

* Delitzsch perhaps states it too strongly when he says: "he avoids even the slightest reference to anything Israelitish."

of the אמר to explain with Ewald, Hahn, *etc.*: "for Job thought."—**It may be that my sons have sinned, and renounced God in their hearts**; to wit, in the intoxication of their abandonment to pleasure, in the wanton or presumptuous spirit produced by their merry-making (comp. Prov. xx. 1; Isa. v. 11; xxviii. 7, *etc.*). Thus it is that Job gives utterance here to that extraordinary earnestness and zeal in fulfilling the Divine will, which leads him to ascribe the highest importance to the avoidance, or, when necessary, the expiation of all sins, even of the heart and the thought. Comp. ch. xxxi. 24, sq. בָּרֵךְ, "to bless, to salute," is also used (*e. g.*, Gen. xlvii. 10; 1 Kings viii. 66) of "bidding farewell to" [taking leave of], here, however, still more definitely in a bad sense, taking leave of one in a hostile spirit; dismissing, renouncing. So also in ver. 11 and ch. ii. 5, 9. The word also admits of the signification "to curse" (comp. Ps. x. 3 [?]; 1 Kings xxi. 10); but most surely this is not the meaning here, where sins of thought simply are referred to. [The bifurcation of definitions, so that the same word is used in a good and a bad sense, is a well-known characteristic of the Hebrew in common with other Semitic languages. Thus חֶסֶד, grace, is used Pro. xiv. 34 in the sense of disgrace. Or, the word in its radical signification is a *vox media*, acquiring its ethical character from the specific application made of it, of which we have a happy illustration in בָּרֵךְ, primarily to kneel, and so to invoke; hence to bless, or to curse, according to the nature of the invocation. And still further: from the meaning to invoke, comes to salute, which again may be to salute with good-will, or with ill-will; in the latter case (if at parting) to dismiss, warn off, renounce. Compare the analogous uses of *χαίρειν* and *valere*. Of the harsher definition, to curse, it may be observed that: (1) We are not restricted to it. The context does not absolutely require it. We are justified both by usage and analogy in adopting the milder definition, to forsake, dismiss. (2) It is more natural to suppose that the children of Job, nurtured, as they must have been, by so tender and conscientious a father, should have been betrayed, during their festivities, into a wanton thoughtlessness, a pleasure-loving alienation from God, than into positive blasphemy. (3) It is more natural to assume that the pious patriarch would be *accustomed* to fear the former, than the latter more heinous evil, in the case of his children. Mark the statement: "thus did Job continually." (4) The qualifying predicate, "in their hearts," agrees better with the idea of forgetting, or forsaking God in feeling, than with that of blasphemy. The latter would seek some overt expression. (5) Job's loving and faithful solicitude for the spiritual welfare of his children is much more strikingly exhibited, if we regard it as prompted by anxiety lest they should have been guilty of even the most secret infidelity in thought or disposition, than if we assume the graver offence to be intended. Lee, following Parkhurst, thinks that Job suspected his children of a tendency to idolatry, and translates: "It may be my sons have sinned and blessed the gods in their hearts." It is sufficient answer to this to say that it violates the *usus loquendi* of אֱלֹהִים, and especially of בָּרֵךְ אֱלֹהִים in our book, that we are not *constrained* to render the verb: "to bless," and that it is opposed to the internal probabilities of the case. "The only false religion we know, from the internal evidence of the poem itself, to have existed at this period, was that of Sabiism, or the worship of the heavenly bodies; but there is nothing to render it even probable that the sons of Job were attached to this." GOOD. The author just quoted (Good) seeks to avoid what he considers the difficulty in the case by giving to the particle ו here a negative sense, under "a philological canon," which he lays down as follows: "that the imperfect negative may be employed alone in every sentence compounded of two opposite propositions, where it becomes the means of connecting the one with the other, such propositions being in a state of reciprocal negation;" and he would translate: "peradventure my sons may have sinned, nor blessed God in their hearts." His own illustrations, however, fail to establish his choice, as in every instance the connective particle has of itself a negative force, such as does not belong to the ו. It is certainly inapplicable to the simple structure of the Hebrew. Merx in his recent version violently and arbitrarily assails the integrity of the text here and elsewhere, where the like expression occurs. In his own text he substitutes קלל for ברך. It is enough to say of this change that, as appears from what has been said above, the necessity for it is altogether imaginary, and that the sole authority for it is the subjective *non possumus* of the critic. —E. "Job is afraid lest his children may have become somewhat unmindful of God during their mirthful gatherings In Job's family, therefore, there was an earnest desire for sanctification, which was far from being satisfied with mere outward propriety of conduct." DEL. "It is curious that the sin which the father's heart dreaded in his children, was the sin to which he himself was tempted, and into which he almost fell. The case of his sons shows one kind of temptation—seduction; and his own case the other — compulsion and hardship."—DAV.]—**Thus did Job continually.**—יַעֲשֶׂה, was wont to do. Comp. Ewald § 136, c. [Green § 263, 4]. כל הימים, literally, "all the days," *i. e.*, continually, always, so long as the particular occasion continued, or so often as it occurred anew. Comp. Deut. iv. 10; vi. 24; xi. 1; 1 Sam. ii. 32.

["Where now such piety was to be found, and such conscientious solicitude to keep his whole house free from sin, there we might expect, judging after the manner of men, that prosperity would abide permanently. This at least we might expect from the stand-point of theory, which regards the outward lot as an index of the moral worth, which assumes piety and prosperity to be inseparable and convertible conceptions. But in Heaven it was otherwise decreed." DILLMANN].

2. The Divine determination to try Job through

suffering. a. The milder trial, the taking away of his possessions. *a.* The preparatory scene in heaven, vers. 6-12.

["Against human expectation and beyond human conception the direst suffering overtakes the pure, pious Job. Whence it came no believer could doubt; but why it came was for the sufferer and his contemporaries a great and difficult problem, with the solution of which they grappled in vehement conflict. The reader of the book would also have remained in entire ignorance of the Divine decree, and would have followed the labyrinthine sinuosities of the contending parties, not with superior discriminating judgment, but with an uncomfortable uncertainty, if the poet had here simply related the calamity into which the pious Job had been plunged by God. It was therefore a correct feeling which influenced the poet to indicate at the outset to the reader the Divine grounds of the decree, and thus to provide for him a pole-star which would guide him through all the entanglement of the succeeding conflicts. This he does by disclosing to us those events, occurring in heaven, which led to the Divine decree concerning Job, the execution of which thereupon follows. No less fine a conception of the poet is the circumstance that the calamity which Job must bear does not overwhelm him all at once, but comes upon him in two visitations, lying somewhat apart in time; the first visitation deprives him of the greatest part of his riches and his children, the second plunges him into the most fearful, and, at the same time, the most hopeless disease. Both visitations wound his feelings in different ways, until on all sides they are tried most thoroughly. Between the two is an interval of rest, in which the stricken one can collect his feelings, and set himself right before God. And as in the second visitation his suffering reaches its climax, so also does his virtue." DILLMANN].

Ver. 6. **Now it came to pass on a day.**—Gesenius, Ewald, Dillmann, *etc.*, would translate הַיּוֹם, "the day," or "that day," giving to the article a retrospective construction. But this favorite mode of expression is found at the beginning of a narrative even when it cannot be considered to have any reference to what has preceded, and where accordingly the translation "at the time specified" is out of the question; *e. g.*, 2 Kings iv. 18. The article here, therefore, is used "because the narrator in thought connects the day with the following occurrence, and this frees it from absolute indefiniteness." DEL. ["We are justified by no analogy in explaining the article as designating the definite day to which that which follows belongs. Ewald rightly explains 'the day' as an indefinite chronological link connecting what follows with what precedes. So also 1 Sam. i. 4; xiv. 1; 2 Kings iv. 18. Compare ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρα, Matt. xiii. 1." SCHLOTT. Others (Dav., Bar., Con.) explain it of the day appointed for the Divine Court (Chald.: day of judgment at the new year), which is not essentially different from the view of Del. adopted by Zöck. In any case it is to be observed that הַיּוֹם is not nominative, but accusative of time.—E.]—**When the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord.**—These words describe the convening of a heavenly assembly, of a celestial סוֹד (ch. xv. 8; comp. Jer. xxiii. 18; Ps. lxxxix. 8). Compare the similar description in 1 Kings xxii. 19 sq., also Isa. vi. 1 sq. בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, the sons of God, *i. e.*, the angels, heavenly spirits; a name to be found also in ch. xxxviii. 7; Gen. vi. 2 [?]; and with slight modification in Ps. xxix. 1; lxxxix. 7; Dan. iii. 25. Elsewhere in our book we find them called "servants," "messengers" (ch. iv. 18), or "saints" (holy ones, ch. v. 1; xv. 15). The name "sons of God" points to the peculiar manner of their creation, which took place *before* the lower spheres of nature or mankind were made (ch. xxxviii. 4-7), as well as to the peculiarly high degree in which they partake of the Divine likeness, and enjoy inward communion with God. ["The word *son* naturally expresses descent; and hence various related notions such as *inheritor*, the idea of similarity, relation, *etc.* So a son of God will be one inheriting the nature or character of God, one descended from Him, or like Him. This similarity may be of two kinds: *first*, in essential nature, that is, *spirit*—hence the angels as distinguished from man and agreeing with God completely in this respect are called *sons of God; second*, in ethical character, that is, holiness, in which sense pious men are called sons of God (Gen. vi. 2). In the former and in the latter sense the holy angels have a right to the title; and in the former sense, though not in the latter, Satan is still named a son of God as inheriting a spiritual nature, and appears in the celestial court." DAV].

לְהִתְיַצֵּב עַל יְהוָה, literally, to set themselves over, *i. e.*, before Jehovah. עַל (instead of which we have elsewhere, *e. g.*, Prov. xxii. 29 לִפְנֵי) "is a usage of language derived from the optical illusion of the one who is in the foreground seeming to range above the one in the background." DEL. Comp. ch. ii. 1; Zech. vi. 5; also the similar expression עמד על in 1 Kings xxxii. 19. [עַל, "as if the King sat, and the courtiers stood *over* him (Isa. vi. 2, מִמַּעַל in a higher degree of the seraphim floating around him off the ground. Drechsler); but this is dubious, for עַל is used where such sense is inadmissible (Judg. iii. 19; with Judg. vi. 31; Gen. xxiv. 30." DAV.] To set themselves before Jehovah is to assume the customary attitude of servants awaiting the command of their master. —**And Satan also came among them.**—[Literally, the Satan. "In 1 Chron. xxi. 1 the name is used without the art.; *i. e.*, has ceased to be appellative and become proper—Satan. In our book and Zechariah the art. is used, and we should perhaps render: the Satan, the adversary. In 1 Kings xxii. 19, where a scene greatly resembling the present is discovered, the tempter bears no name; but his individuality is distinct, for he is characterized as *the spirit*. The use of the art. cannot be of any great weight as an argument as to the era of our book." DAV.]

Concerning the signification of the name הַשָּׂטָן (instead of which we are not, with Eichhorn, Herder, Ilgen, Stuhlmann, *etc.*, to read חַשְׂטָן, ὁ περιοδεύτης, the world-spy, from שׁוּט, ver. 7), as also concerning the relation of the representation of Satan in our book, to that of the other Old Testament books generally, see Doctrinal and Ethical remarks.

Ver. 7. **And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou?**—מֵאַיִן תָּבֹא, the sense being: whence art thou just now coming? the imperf. expressing the immediate present [Satan being conceived as in the act of making his appearance.—E.] (Ewald, § 136, b). The question is certainly not simply "for the purpose of introducing the transaction" (Dillm.); there lies more in it, to wit, the intimation that Satan's ways are not God's ways; that it is his *wont* to roam about, a being without stability, malicious, intent upon evil; that there is in his case a *reason*, which does not exist in the case of God's true children, the angels, why God should inquire after his crooked and crafty ways, and compel him thereby to give an account of his restless, arbitrary movements. As Cocceius has truly said: "Satan is represented as transacting his own affairs as it were without the knowledge, *i. e.*, without the approbation of God." (Comp. Seb. Schmidt, p. 25, and Ludw. Schulze, in the *Allg. literar. Anzeiger*, 1870, Oct., p. 270). **From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it.**—UMBREIT is right in calling attention to the curt brevity of this reply of Satan's. It is also to be noted, however, that the answer is of necessity somewhat general, giving rise to the expectation that Jehovah will follow with a more particular question (comp. Delitzsch). שׁוּט בְּ describes the more rapid passage through a place, scouring it from one end to another (comp. Num. xi. 8) [of the people scattering themselves to collect manna]; 2 Sam. xxiv. 2 [of the census taken when David numbered the people]; likewise the Synon. שׁוֹטֵט (Amos viii. 12; Jerem. v. 1; Zech. iv. 10; 2 Chron. xvi. 9): הִתְהַלֵּךְ describes the more deliberate movement of one who is traveling for observation (Zech. i. 10, 11; vi. 7; comp. Gen. iii. 8; also the περιπατεῖν of the adversary, who goes about espying whom he may devour, 1 Pet. v. 8). [Acc. to Ges., שׁוּט is a verb denominative from שׁוֹט, whip, scourge; and is used in Kal. of rowing (Ezek. xxvii. 8), *i. e.* lashing the sea with oars, and of running to and fro in haste, pr. so as to lash the air with one's arms as with oars, "happily enough describing Satan's functions, 'going about,' inspecting, tempting, trepanning, taking up evil reports of all men" (DAV.). The signification "to compass" (Sept. περιελθων) is not exact.—E.]. Here belongs the Arabic designation of the devil as El-Harith, the busy-body, ever-active, zealous one. ["In the life of Zoroaster (see Zend Avesta, by J. G. Kleuker, vol. iii., p. 11), the prince of the evil demons, the angel of death, whose name is Engremeniosch, is said to traverse the whole earth far and wide, with intent to oppose and injure in every possible way all good men." ROSENM.]

Ver. 8. **Hast thou considered my servant Job?**—Literally, hast thou set thine heart on, *etc.* שִׂים לֵב=*animadvertere* ["*animum advertere*, for לֵב is *animus*, נֶפֶשׁ, *anima*," DEL.], construed here with עַל ["of the object on which the attention falls," DEL.], as in Hag. i. 5, 7; below, ch. ii. 3, with אֶל ["of the object towards which it is directed," DEL.]. **For there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man,** *etc.* כִּי, "for," giving the reason not for the title, "my servant" (HIRZ.), but for the circumstance that Jehovah makes special inquiry after this man. The four qualities predicated concerning Job are repeated here from ver. 1 (with the omission, however, of the Vav connective between the two pairs). In this, the impress of the epic-narrative character of this section of the book is visible, and it appears again in the refrain-like repetitions of vers. 16, 17, 18. The same may be observed in the Mosaic account of the creation, Gen. i. ["The Deity reiterates the description of Job given by the historian; it is, therefore, a first principle and action of the drama that Job was sinless, keeping all the commandments with a perfect heart, and in *spite* of this—which Job himself knew, and which the author knew—nay, *because* of this, he was grievously tormented. And herein just lay the problem for Job and the overwhelming strength of the temptation, leading him in the madness of despair, both physical and speculative, to renounce God to his face, and assert the government of the world to be hopelessly chaotic and unjust. Spirits like that of Job could not be reached in meaner ways; passion has long been mastered; there is nothing but his very strength and calmness and faith to work upon; his first principles, the laborious deductions of a religious life, and the deepest experience of a loving heart—confusion must be introduced there, between the man's notions of God and providence, and his necessary ideas of right on the one side, and on the other the actual appearance of the universe fearfully contravening them, thus leading him into atheism. . . . His trial was not for his sin, but for his sinlessness, to prove and establish it. . . . Job's sufferings had no doubt relation to his sin, they gave him deeper views of it, and of God's holiness; but that is not the great truth the book teaches." DAV. It is significant, as Hengstenberg observes, that in these preliminary transactions, which at length issued in Job's trial, Jehovah takes the initiative. He directs Satan's attention to the piety of Job; it is his use of the argument which Job's character furnishes in favor of the reality of godliness in a human life that evokes the Adversary's malignity in the challenge which fires the train of Job's calamities. To such an extent is the agency of Satan secondary and subordinate throughout, that not only must he receive God's permission before he can proceed one step against Job, but the very occasion through which he obtains that permission is gratuitously provided for him by God. So absolute is the

Divine Sovereignty. Thus completely are even the occasions of evil within the limitations of the Divine will. And thus is our confidence strengthened at the outset in the ultimate inevitable triumph of the Divine purpose.—E.].

Ver. 9. **Doth Job fear God for naught?** [A little more literally: For naught hath Job feared God? חִנָּם, emphatic by position; יָרֵא, which above in vers. 1, 8 is a participle, here a Pret. (Perf.) of that which has been hitherto, and still is.—E.]. חִנָּם, *gratis*, from חֵן, *gratia*, here equivalent to gratuitously, groundlessly, without good reason [LXX. δωρεάν comp. the δωρεάν of John xv. 25) without reward, or profit. ["Genuine love loves God, חִנָּם; it loves Him for His own sake; it is a relation of person to person, without any actual stipulations and claim." Del. Satan denies this of Job. Compare the three-fold use of חִנָּם in this book; by Satan of Job here; by God of Satan, ch. ii. 3; by Job of God, ch. ix. 17.—E.] The question, which is asked in order to throw suspicion on the pure and disinterested character of Job's piety, is thoroughly characteristic of Satan in his character of Accuser of men (κατήγωρ, Rev. xii. 10; διάβολος, Matt. iv. 1, *etc.*). ["This question: Does Job serve God for naught? is the problem of the book." Dav.].

Ver. 10. **Hast thou not made a hedge about him, and about his house, and about all that he hath on every side?**—The figure used here, borrowed from the enclosure of a garden or a field for protection against wild beasts (Matt. xxi. 33), is somewhat analogous to the modern figurative expression: "to make one's bed warm and soft for him. [אַתְּ (without the final ה) emphatic: Hast not *Thou* made a hedge about him? *Thou*—the Almighty One, whose protection is all-sufficient. Ought he not to serve *Thee*, his Defender and Benefactor? Would not self-interest prompt him to this?—E.]. שׂוּךְ, *sepire*, to hedge about, as in Hos. ii. 8. [Here in a good sense, for protection; below, iii. 23, in a bad sense, to straiten. Good remarks that "to give the original verb the full force of its meaning, it should be derived from the science of engineering, and rendered: 'Hast thou not raised a palisade about him?' But this last term is not sufficiently colloquial." Wemyss unnecessarily assumes the hedge here to be a guard of angels. The Arabic has: "Hast thou not protected him with thy hand?" The Chald. Paraphrase: "Hast thou not covered him with thy word?" The Coptic: "Hast thou not been a fence to his possessions?"—E.] The preposition בַּעַד it is much better to derive from a verb בָּעַד, synonymous with the root בגד, to cover, to veil [with which root it is also cognate: see Ewald, § 217, m], than from the prepositions בְּ and עַד, of which most regard the word as compounded (as is held even yet by Delitzsch, and Dietrich in his Ed. of Gesen. Lex.). There lies in the three-fold repetition of this word a special emphasis, which is still further strengthened by the addition, at the close of the question, of מִסָּבִיב, round about, on every side, "without leaving a gap through which harm might enter." Dillm.—LXX.: "Hast thou not hedged round the parts without him, and the inner parts of his house, and that which is without all his possessions round about?"] **Thou hast blessed the work of his hands.** מַעֲשֵׂה יָדָיו (as in Ps. xc. 17; Deut. ii. 7; xiv. 29, *etc.*), a general designation of all a man's enterprises and activities. Compare as to sense the parallel passage, Gen. xxxix. 3 (where it is said of Joseph: the Lord made all that he did to prosper in his hand").—**And his herds spread in the land**: literally, his stock of cattle, פָּרַץ, *breaks through* in the land, like a flood breaking through an embankment (מַיִם כְּפֶרֶץ, 2 Sam. v. 20), or like a herd breaking out of a fold. Comp. Gen. xxviii. 14; xxx. 30, 43; 2 Chron. ii. 23; Isaiah xlv. 2.—[So the versions of Junius and Tremellius and Piscator: And his cattle for multitude have burst forth through the land. Conant: "his substance is spread abroad *in the earth*," which, he thinks, "is better than *in the land*, as it is the Adversary's object to express, in the strongest terms, the extent of Job's possessions." On "Thou hast blessed," *etc.*, Wordsworth remarks: "Even Satan confesses that God's benediction is the source of all good to man."—E.]

Ver. 11. **But put forth thy hand now, and touch all that he hath.**—וְאוּלָם, nevertheless, *verum enim vero*, introducing with strong emphasis the direct opposite of Jehovah's eulogy on Job (comp. ch. xi. 5; xii. 7; xvii. 10; xxxiii. 1). [שְׁלַח־נָא, Methegh accompanying Sheva. Green, § 45, 4],—נגע with בְּ (as in ch. xix. 21), sometimes with אֶל (as in ch. ii. 5), to touch, to lay the hand on anything, with intent to injure or destroy. ["*Touch*, or as it may be translated, *smite*, as below in ver. 19. But the former sense is more appropriate here, as indicating how easily all this worldly prosperity would vanish at the *touch* of the Almighty." Conant. "נָגַע frequently of the evil touch which blasts; of the scattering wind (Ezek. xvii. 10); of the consuming touch of God (Job xix. 21; Isai. liii. 4; Ps. lxxiii. 14); the fiery effect of the divine touch (and look) marvellously told Ps. civ. 32." Dav. "Satan wishes to make God the author of evil; but God does not inflict evil on Job; but allows Satan to put forth *his* hand (ver. 12), and afflict him." Didymus, quoted by Wordsworth].—**Verily he will curse Thee to Thy face.**—אִם־לֹא וגו׳, not, "will he not curse, *etc.*" (and thus=*an non*, as in ch. xvii. 2; xxii. 20), but the formula of an oath, with the apodosis omitted,="truly, verily" (LXX.: εἰ μήν). It is more suitable to Satan's insolent, reckless character to represent him as swearing that God is mistaken, than as questioning and calling upon God to watch and see, whether he is not mistaken [as *e. g.* Renan's version: *et on verra s'il ne te renie pas en face.*] בֵּרֵךְ, here again=

valedicere, take leave of, as in ver. 5, but strengthened here, so as to emphasize the shameless arrogance of the deed by the addition of עַל־פָּנֶיךָ, "to thy face," literally "upon thy face," as in ch. vi. 28; xxi. 31; Isai. lxv. 3; comp. אֶל־פָּנִים, ch. ii. 5; xiii. 15; בְּפָנָיו, ch. xvi. 8. [The refusal of Good and Lee to entertain any other meaning for בֵּרֵךְ than "to bless" leads them here, as also in ch. ii 5, to forced and untenable constructions. Good's rendering: "Will he then, indeed, bless thee to thy face?" is entirely against the usage of the particles, אִם־לֹא, which elsewhere are strongly affirmative, not negative, and, moreover, leaves the qualifying clause, "to thy face," meaningless. Lee's rendering is even more objectionable: "But put forth thine hand now, and touch all that he hath: if not (*i. e.* if thou continue thy favors), then in thy presence will he bless thee." A forced construction, and a feeble conclusion, entirely unworthy of the Satan of our book. —E.].

Ver. 12. **Behold, all that he hath is in thy power:** literally, is in thy hand; is delivered to thee. The divine permission appears here at the same time as a divine command; for such a permissive activity, on the part of God, as would admit of his remaining purely passive, is altogether unknown to the Old Testament (comp. Isai. xlv. 7). Rather do we find that whenever men are tempted, it is because they are left by God to be tried, because He forsakes them, or withdraws His hand from them (2 Chron. xxxii. 31; Ps. xxvii. 9, and often)—simple representations, parallel to that in the passage before us, and substantially equivalent to it (comp. Vilmar, *Theol. Mor.*, 1871, I., p. 163). God, indeed, in decreeing that Job shall be tempted, has altogether other ends in view than those which are sought by the Adversary, who is commissioned to carry on the work of the temptation. While the latter desires, through his art as tempter, to compass the fall of Job, it is God's will rather that he should endure the test, that thereby he may be not only lifted up by purification to the highest degree of virtue and piety, but also proved to be in truth a man of piety, who feared God, Satan and all other doubters to the contrary notwithstanding. That which is here put in operation is thus, on the part of God, a trial of Job, putting him to the proof; on the part of Satan, a veritable temptation to lead him astray. The motive from which the divine decree ordaining the trial proceeds is naught else than love, delivering and preserving the soul; that from which proceeds the action of the agent for the fulfilment of that decree is hate, the spirit which would murder body and soul, a diabolical satisfaction in causing a poor man's body and soul to be destroyed in hell (Matt. x. 28; Luke xii. 4 [where, however, God is meant, not the devil.—E.]). Therefore does God annex to the permission which He here grants Satan the warning prohibition: "only upon himself put not forth thy hand." For He well knows the lust of murder and the thirst for destruction which possesses him who is a murderer and a liar from the beginning. **So Satan went forth from the presence of the Lord.**—וַיֵּצֵא, literally, "and Satan went out," *i. e.* out of the hall where the celestial assembly was convened. Immediately upon receiving the Divine license, he left the place, to begin the work of temptation in which he longed to engage. ["He went forth at once, the ardor with which he entered on his work being thus set forth." DILLM. "As Cain did (Gen. iv. 16), and as Judas did from the presence of Christ (John xiii. 30)." WORDS.]

3. (*b*) *Job's actual trial in the execution of the decree on his possessions and family*, vers. 13-19.

["In the opening verses the author gave us a glimpse of the calm sunshine of Job's domestic life, its happy unity and religious simplicity. In the next few verses he took us elsewhere, and showed the first far-gatherings of the storm; and now it breaks in unheard-of fury, scattering ruin and scathing all that was beautiful in earth and man. The heavenly and the earthly combine, and there results a tumultuous mixture absolutely appalling in its workings. Heaven and earth unite to sow destruction around Job; all the destructive forces in nature, men's evil passions and heaven's lurking fire, are drawn out to overwhelm him. Man and heaven alternate in their eager fury for his ruin—first the Sabean horde, then the lightnings, then the "hasty and bitter" Chaldeans, and finally the tempest. Only one escapes each stroke, and yet one, for the man must know the outside of his ruin, and he must know it at once; each wave must come higher than the foregoing—the cattle, least numerous; the flocks, a deeper loss; the camels, more precious still; and, cruelest of all, a loss unlike all else—the children—and each wave comes up before the preceding has time to recede. All antiquity and human thought cannot produce three such scenes as these; the first so lovely in its peace and righteousness; the second so awful in its far sublimity, unveiling to our eyes the hidden powers that play with and for us; and now the third, so wild in its fury and frantic in its malignant outbursts—and all to be followed by one so dreadful in its calmness and iron composure, when a human spirit stands alone in its own conscious greatness, independent of earth, and defiant of hell." DAV.] All that the poet in vers. 2-4 has described as the property of his hero, he now represents as in one day taken away from him. This is done in four stages, or by four strokes, following each other in immediate succession [and immediately announced to him, whence the German proverbial expression *Hiobsposten*, "Job's posts," applied to tidings of calamity. Compare in English the proverbial expression: "Job's comforters."—E.] These four strokes are: (1) The loss of the oxen and the asses. (2) The loss of the sheep, representing the smaller cattle. (3) The loss of the camels. Each of these calamities was accompanied by the slaying of the servants in charge of the animals specified. (4) The loss of the children. In so far as the fourth of these losses was by far the most severe and painful, a gradation of woe appears in the series. [Ewald, followed by Dill-

mann and others. has remarked upon the peculiarity that the first and third of the calamities are ascribed to human, the second and fourth to celestial agencies.—E. "It is not accidental (says Hengstenberg) that there are just four catastrophes, divided into two pairs, and corresponding to the fourfold particularization of the righteousness of Job. In them may be seen a sort of irony of destiny touching his and all human righteousness."]

Ver. 13. **And there was a day** [literally: **Now it was the day,** or: It came to pass on the day, *viz.:* when Satan, in pursuance of his fell purpose, visited on Job the first installment of woe, his children having assembled in the house of their eldest brother to begin their festivities. On that same day, the first and brightest of the festal round, the fatal stroke fell.—E.] **when his sons and his daughters were eating and drinking wine in their eldest brother's house** [**in the house of their brother, the first-born**], *i. e.*, according to ver. 4, were celebrating the birth-day of this first-born, on a day, therefore, which was one of especial joy to Job's entire household. See above on vers. 4, 5.

Vers. 14, 15. The first loss: that of the oxen and the she-asses, together with the servants in charge.

Ver. 14. **Then came a messenger to Job,** *etc.* Literally: **And a messenger came,** *etc.* —The ו introduces the conclusion of the conditional sentence וּבָנָיו וגו׳ in ver. 13 [*i. e.*, when his sons, *etc.*, then it was that a messenger came]. Comp. ver. 19, and Ewald, § 341 d.—**The oxen were ploughing, and the she-asses feeding beside them.**—The participial construction describes the condition which was disturbed by the calamity that befell them (Del., comp. Ewald, § 168 c). [This remark includes the construction of the partic. with היה, which is not (with Fürst, and others) to be regarded as a simple periphrasis for the narrative tense, as is usual in Aramean; היה on the contrary has its own force, defining the *time* of the continuous *condition* expressed by the participle.—E.] The partic. stands in the fem. plur., חֹרְשׁוֹת, because בָּקָר is a collective noun, and, more particularly, because the females of the class, cows, are intended. Subsequently, however, and referring back to this חֹרְשׁוֹת, we find the masc. suffix יְדֵיהֶם in use as the more general or primary gender (Ewald, § 184 c. [Green, § 220, 1, b], and comp. ch. xxxix. 3, 4; xlii. 15). עַל־יְדֵיהֶם, literally: "on, or at, their hands." The meaning is not "in their places," as some Rabbis and Böttcher explain it, referring to Num. ii. 17; Deut. xxiii. 13 [nor "according to their custom," *more solito*, Schult; nor "at some distance," Wem.]; but, as the connection shows, "on both sides of them" (comp. Judg. xi. 26), or simply "beside them" (=אֶצְלָם, comp. Num. xxxiv. 3).

Ver. 15. **And the Sabeans fell upon them**; literally: **And Sabea fell,** *etc.*—שְׁבָא, as the name of a people, is used in the feminine (Ewald, § 174, b); it is followed, however, by the masc. plur. הִכּוּ [see Green, § 197, d]. By שְׁבָא here is meant not the rich, commercial Sabeans of Southern Arabia, referred to in ch. vi. 19, but the related branch of the same people in northeastern Arabia, who lived the nomadic life of predatory Bedouins, ranging from the Persian Gulf to Idumea, neighbors and kindred of the tribe of Dedan, who also lived in North Arabia; Gen. x. 7; xxv. 3. Genesis still further makes mention of three races of the name, the Cushite, (ch. x. 9), the Joktanite (x. 28), and the Abrahamic, or Keturic (xxv. 3), which shows in general the mixed character of this people. [Schlottmann, while agreeing with Zöck. as to the branch of the family here referred to, shows on the authority of Pliny and Strabo, that the Sabeans of Southern Arabia were robbers as well as traders.—E.]—**And they have slain the servants with the edge of the sword.**—The servants here were the young herdsmen in charge of the cattle [lit.: "the young men;" LXX., τοὺς παῖδας; Jerome, *pueros;* Luther, "the boys;" so in slave communities servants are called boys.—E.] With the edge; literally: according to the [mouth, *i. e.*,] sharpness of the sword (לְפִי חָרֶב), *i. e.*, unsparingly. [According to Ges. and Furst לְ here denotes the instrument. "The objection to Gesenius' view is obviated by the near relation between the ideas of agency and instrumentality; and any other explanation of his examples is unnatural and forced." Con.—**And only I alone escaped to tell thee.**—["Chrysostom (Hom. 2 et 3 de patient. Jobi) fancies that the מַלְאָךְ was Satan himself, who indulged himself in the gratification of bringing the ill tidings to Job." Dillm.] The ה paragogic in וָאִמָּלְטָה does not mark here the cohortative use of the verb, but simply makes more vivid the verbal notion, in order to show the haste with which he escaped. ["I have saved myself with great difficulty." Del.] Comp. Gesenius, § 49, 2; Ewald, § 232, g. The clause לְהַגִּיד לָךְ is objective: in order that, in accordance with the Divine decree, I might tell thee.

Ver. 16. The second loss: that of the smaller cattle, with the servants in charge.—**While this one was yet speaking, there came another,** *etc.* — The same connection between the circumstantial participial clause and the principal clause, as in verse 13. (Ewald, § 341, d) זֶה־זֶה, "the one—the other," and so again in ch. xxi. 23, 25.—**The fire of God fell from heaven and burned up the sheep,** *etc.*—By "the fire of God" the author means the lightning rapidly repeating itself [see Ex. ix. 23], which might be particularly destructive to the flocks of smaller cattle (Ps. lxxviii.), and the agency of which in suddenly burning and devouring is certainly described in 1 Kings xviii. 38; 2 Kings i. 12) (comp. Luke ix. 54). [The expression: "fire of God," indicates the poetic character of the description here given; and the entire sentence:

"the fire of God fell from heaven," is manifestly designed to show that Satan moved heaven and earth to combine in inflicting disaster on Job, so as to leave him without hope in either quarter.—E.] It is less natural to assume a rain of fire and brimstone, like that of Sodom (Del.); neither does the language used suit the burning sulphurous south wind called the Samûm (Schlott.), as a comparison with Ps. xi. 6 shows. [The latter theory moreover would result in making too little distinction between this calamity and the fourth.—E.]

Ver. 17. The third loss: that of the camels, with their keepers. *The Chaldeans* **formed three bands**; lit.: "Made three heads" (Luther: drei spitzen), *i. e.*, three army-bands or divisions. For רָאשִׁים in this sense, see Judges vii. 16; ix. 34; 1 Sam. xi. 11. As substantially parallel, comp. also Gen. xiv. 15, where the same primitive tactics and strategy are described as practiced by Chedorlaomer and his vassal-kings. "Without any authority, Ewald sees in this mention of the Chaldeans an indication of the composition of the book in the seventh century B. C., when the Chaldeans under Nabopolassar began to inherit the Assyrian power. Following Ewald, Renan observes that the Chaldeans first appear as such marauders about the time of Uzziah. But in Genesis we find mention of early Semitic Chaldeans among the mountain ranges lying to the north of Assyria and Mesopotamia (in Arphaxad, Gen. x. 22, or Ur of the Chaldees, Gen. xi. 28, 31; comp. the Charduchian range of Xenophon; and later, of Nahorite Chaldeans in Mesopotamia, whose existence is traced back to patriarchal times (Gen. xxii. 22), and who were powerful enough at any time to make a raid into Idumea." DEL. (Comp. also Dillmann, who, although an advocate of the later period to which the composition of the book is assigned, is careful not to try to make capital for his theory out of this passage).—**And set upon the camels.**—פָּשַׁט, literally: to strip, to pillage. [According to Gesenius the primary meaning is to spread out; hence of an invading army, in Nah. iii. 16, of locusts. This sense best agrees with the prepositions with which it is construed: here עַל, and so Judges ix. 33; elsewhere אֶל, 1 Sam. xxvii. 8; בְּ, 2 Chron. xxv. 13.—E.] The technical expression for such marauding invasions, or raids. Comp. Judg. ix. 33, 44; 1 Sam. xxiii. 27; xxx. 14; Hos. vii. 1.

Vers. 18, 19. The fourth loss: that of the sons and daughters.

Ver. 18. **While this one was yet speaking,** *etc.* Instead of עוֹד (vers. 16, 17), we have here עַד, which appears in connection with the participle, in the sense of "while," also in Nehem. vii. 3.—The supposition of Schlott. [also of Hengst.], that "this slight change of expression is made to distinguish the two following verses from the preceding, because they relate the greatest loss," is disproved by the circumstance that the change is too insignificant, being scarcely noticeable. The conjecture of Dillmann and some of the earlier commentators is more plausible, that instead of עַד, we should read עֹד, defectively written, which in fact is the reading of some MSS.

Ver. 19. **Behold there came a great wind from beyond the wilderness**; *i. e.* hither across over the desert. ["From the further side, gathering strength and violence as it approached from far. Is. xxi. 1; Jer. iv. 11; Hos. xiii. 15." DAV.] As the land of Uz in our narrative stands west of the great North-Arabian desert [see on ver. 1], the wind spoken of here is to be taken as a storm from the east, or possibly from the north-east rather. It is, moreover, evidently a whirlwind that is intended, for the house is smitten on its four corners, and is thus made to fall, like the house described in Matt. vii. 27. ["The violence of the winds of the Arabian desert is well known. When Pietro della Valle travelled through this desert in the year 1625, the wind tore to pieces the tents of his caravan." HIRZEL.]—**And smote the four corners,** *etc.* [וַיִּגַּע, in the masc., although the subject, רוּחַ, is first construed as fem. (בָּאָה). The use of the masc. belongs probably to the poetic vividness of the description. The change would be the more readily made in this case, as רוּחַ is sometimes, though rarely, masc.; comp. ch. xli. 8 (A. V. 16).—E.]—**And it fell upon the young people**; *i. e.* the ten children of Job, along with whom no special mention is made here of the servants in attendance, who probably perished with them, for the reason that their loss, in comparison with the far more grievous loss of his children, would not be taken into account by Job.—הַנְּעָרִים, here, and ch. xxix. 5 (so also Ruth ii. 21), plur. of the epicene noun נַעַר, which in the Pentateuch also is used both for a young man and a young woman. [Conant thinks, "it is the less necessary to assume such a usage here, as the attention of the messenger would naturally be directed to the fate of the sons in which all were involved." The view of Jarchi, as explained by Bernard: "'There was no occasion to mention the daughters,' meaning thereby that the daughters were of little consequence," would meet with little favor at the present day. Ewald, speaking of the effect of this calamity on Job, remarks, it would add to the stunning force of the blow, that all this happened during the first day of a joyous festival, and consequently before the children could have incurred much guilt, according to the father's apprehension as expressed in vers. 4, 5, so that the poet can furnish no sufficient occasion for their destruction in the greatness of their sin. This may be regarded as an additional and sufficient reason for assigning these calamities to the day when the entertainment took place in the house of the first-born, without having recourse to the theory that it was a birth-day feast. Wordsworth's remark on the sweeping, all-embracing aspect of the destruction wrought is striking: "Satan had said, that God had 'hedged in Job on all sides;' but now Job is attacked on all sides; from the south by Sabeans; from the east by Chaldeans; from heaven by fire and whirlwind, or tornado, which assailed all the corners of the house of

Job's eldest son, in which his children were gathered together, and which fell upon them, and buried them in their hour of feasting." —E.]

4. (*y*) *Job's Constancy and Patience. Vers.* 20-22.

Ver. 20. **Then Job arose, and rent his mantle, and shaved his head:** both well-known oriental gestures, expressive of violent grief, rending the mantle, the outer garment, מְעִיל ["an exterior tunic, fuller and longer than the common one, but without sleeves; worn by men of birth and rank, by kings and princes, by priests, *etc.*" Ges.—Comp. ch. ii. 12; xxix. 14], and shaving the head, including the beard ["a sign of mourning among other nations, but not allowed to the Hebrews (Lev. xxi. 5; Deut. xiv. 1; comp. Ezek. xliv. 20), except to certain persons, *e. g.* the Nazarites. See Num. vi. 9. This, as Professor S. Lee observes, is another evidence of Job's independence of the Levitical law: see ver. 5. The Hebrews in time of mourning sometimes plucked off the hair, as well as rent the mantle: see Ezra ix. 3." Words.] Job's rising is mentioned simply as a preparatory motion, and as a sign of strong mental agitation, not as an independent gesture of grief. So also the clause which follows: "and fell down upon the ground," is to be regarded not as an attitude of sorrow, but rather as preparatory to the worship of God in the immediate connection. This act of adoration (*προσκύνησις*) accordingly is presented in a twofold manner: first by the circumstantial preparatory clause, וַיִּפֹּל אַרְצָה, then by the exact *terminus technicus* for adoration, וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ. (Comp. Hoelemann, *Ueber die biblische Gestalt der Anbetung*, in his *Bibelstudien*, Part I., 1859.) ["Job's recognition of the quarter whence his sorrows came, and his feeling of God's right to send them, and their ultimate (after some rockings) spiritual effect upon him, are finely exhibited in this verb. Human nature and grief has its rights first—the heart must utter itself in words or actions; but the paroxysm over, a deeper calm succeeds—a closer feeling of heaven, as after the thunder and tempestuous obscuration, the heavens are deeper and more transparent." Dav.]

Ver. 21. The devout expression of the sufferer's lament and resignation is put in poetic form, in parallel members, clearly proving that the author of the prologue is the same with the author of the poem. Comp. Introd. § 8. —**Naked came I out of my mother's womb.**—יָצָתִי, defectively written, as in ch. xxxii. 18; Num. xi. 11.—**And naked shall I return thither.**—The difficult word, שָׁמָּה, "thither" meaning "into the womb" (not as Böttcher explains, "into the earth," as though Job, in speaking, pointed with his finger to the ground), may be explained in two ways: either with Hahn and Hupfeld, "thither, whence I came, in coming out of my mother's womb, to wit, out of the state of nonentity" [So Dav.: "Mother's womb is considered synonymous with non-existence, and death is a return *thither* again into such a state"]; comp. ch. xxx. 23; Ps. ix. 18 (17 E. V.); or, more probably, by assuming a slight poetic ambiguity, by virtue of which "womb" in the second instance represents its counterpart, the bosom of mother earth: comp. Ps. cxxxix. 13, 15; Sir. xl. 1 ["A heavy yoke is upon the sons of Adam from the day that they go out of their mother's womb till the day that they return to the mother of all things." Cyprian, quoting our passage, has it thus: "Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I go under the earth." "Dans le second membre," says Renan, "l'auteur passe à l'idée du sein de la terre, mére de tous les hommes."—E.] The thought expressed here and elsewhere, as in Eccles. v. 14 (15 E. V. see Comment. on the passage), that man departs hence as naked and helpless as he came here, is moreover only a deduction from that fundamental truth of antiquity announced in Gen. iii. 19 (Eccles. xii. 7). But to go further, and, taking בֶּטֶן אִמִּי in the sense of earth's bosom, the interior of the earth, to find here the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls (J. D. Michaelis, Knapp, *etc.*), this is to do gross violence to the plain phraseology of the passage, and is, at the same time, to foist surreptitiously on our book a dogma of later times, nowhere to be met with in the Old Testament.—**Blessed be the name of Jehovah** מְבֹרָךְ, "blessed, praised," in a sense exactly opposite to that of ver. 11, but chosen by the poet with express reference to the use there made by Satan of the word. Instead of the curse he wished for, the Tempter is compelled to hear from the sorely tried man God praised in benedictions. Job here gives evidence of being a believer in Jehovah, a confessor of the only true and eternal God, as his threefold use of the name יְהוָה proves. In his later discourses, this name retires before the name of God in general use in the patriarchal age, and occurs again only once (ch. xii. 9). Comp. Introd. § 5. ["Faith, expressing itself in the most vivid language, seizes on the most elevated, joyous, expressive name. As in regard to the matter, so also in regard to the name, Job is here raised above himself." Hengst.]

Ver. 22. **In all this Job sinned not.**—בְּכָל־זֹאת, not "in all that which Job said and did" (Muntinghe, Rosenm., *etc.*), which would be a very flat statement; but in all that befell him, in all these dispensations. The LXX. correctly: *ἐν τούτοις πᾶσι τοῖς συμβεβηκόσιν αὐτῷ*. The expression reaches back beyond vers. 20, 21, although without excluding that which is here related as said and done by Job. **And showed no folly toward God:** lit. and **gave forth no folly toward God;** *i. e.* uttered against Him nothing foolish, nothing senseless (תִּפְלָה, the same as the adj. תָּפֵל, meaning stale, insipid, ch. vi. 6; comp. ch. xxiv. 12; Jer. xxv. 18). Comp. Jerome: *neque stultum quid contra Deum locutus est:* and among the moderns more especially Rosenm., Rödiger (in Ges. Thesaurus, p. 15, 16), Oehl., Vaih. [Noy. Bar. app'y, Con.]; Dillm. also, who explains: "offered to God nothing unsavory, *i. e.*, nothing

to displease him." ["It is curious to observe that in many languages, modern as well as ancient, wisdom is represented under the character of *sapidity*, or a palatable *stimulus*, and folly under that of insipidity, or anything devoid of stimulus. . . . So while the Hebrew term here employed (תפל) means equally *froth*, *insipidity*, *folly*, or obtuseness of intellect, its opposite, which is טעם, means, in like manner, *taste*, *poignancy*, *discernment*, superiority of intellect; terms which the Arabs yet retain, and in both senses." GOOD. For further illustration, G. refers to the proverbial "Attic salt" of the Greeks, for the flavor of wit and wisdom.—To this should be added, that in Scripture these terms have an ethical, as well as an intellectual significance, so that as "wisdom" is one of the most important equivalents of piety, "folly" stands in the same relation to impiety. And so here. Job, in his trial, uttered nothing which betrayed a heart unsalted by wisdom and grace, no spiritual absurdity which betokened a spirit at variance with the Supreme Wisdom.—E.] Altogether too inexact and free are the renderings, on the one hand, of Umbreit: "and permitted himself nothing foolish against God;" on the other hand of Ewald and Hahn: "and gave God no offence." Contrary to usage is Olshausen's rendering of תפלה as equivalent to "abuse, reviling" ("he gave God no abuse," *i. e.*, reviled him not: so the Pesh.) [Renan: "he uttered no blasphemy against God"]. The connection, however, forbids the explanation of Hirz., Stick., Schlott., Del. [Merx, Dav., Röd., Elz.]: "he did not charge God with folly, attributed to him no foolishness." [So substantially E. V.: "he did not charge God foolishly."] For at first Job shows himself far removed from that extreme violence of feeling which later in the history leads him once and again to the very verge of blasphemy, to represent God, for instance, as his cruel tormentor and persecutor. It would be very strange and quite premature for the poet to introduce here an allusion to those later aberrations.

5. (*b*) The severer trial: the loss of health. (*a*). The preparatory scene in heaven, ch. ii. 1-6. Ver. 1. **Now it came to pass on a day.**—Not, of course, on the same day as that mentioned ch. i. 13, but after a certain interval, which is not more particularly defined. The art. here, הַיּוֹם, as in ch. i. 6 q.v. It will be observed that here there is a variation from the statement in ch. i. 6 in the use of לְהִתְיַצֵּב with Satan, as well as with "the sons of God;" indicating, as Del. and Dillm. have shown, that he, as well as they, appeared at this time in the heavenly assembly with a definite object. What that object was is made to appear immediately in the succeeding dialogue between Jehovah and Satan.—E.]

Ver. 2. **From whence comest thou?**—Here אֵי מִזֶּה, instead of the earlier מֵאַיִן, ch. i. 7; the only variation, and a slight one, of the language in that verse, which is otherwise repeated here word for word. The same is true of the following verse, at least of the first and longer part of it, which is an exact repetition of ch. i. 8 with one slight variation, the substitution of אֶל for עַל before עַבְדִּי.

Ver. 3. **And still he holdeth fast to his piety**, *i. e.*, notwithstanding the heavy calamities which have visited him, he still maintains a blameless life. תֻּמָּה, the quality of the תָּם. ch. i. 1. Comp. ch. xxvii. 5; xxxi. 6; Prov. xi. 3 [the only passage where the word occurs outside of our book.—E.]—**Although thou didst move me against him to destroy him without cause.**—Lit.: "And so thou didst move me against him," *etc.*; the imperf. consec. here not in the inferential sense, "so that thou," *etc.* (Hirz., Stick., Hahn, Dillm. [Hengst.]), but adversative rather: "*and yet* thou didst move me," *etc.* (Rosm., Ew., Umbr., Vaih., Heilig. [Noy., Rod., Wem.. Bev., Con., Elz.]). With this construction the חִנָּם, "without cause, undeservedly," is by no means at variance; for this expression only enhances the reproachfulness of Jehovah's address.—With הֵסִית בְּ, to excite, stir up against any one, comp. 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 (but differently in Josh. xv. 18; 1 Chron. xxi. 1). [It "does not signify, as Umbreit thinks, to lead astray, in which case it were almost a blasphemous anthropomorphism; it signifies *instigare*, and indeed generally to evil, as *e. g.*, 1 Chron. xxi. 1; but not always, *e. g.*, Josh. xv. 18; here it is certainly in a strongly anthropopathical sense of the impulse given by Satan to Jehovah to prove Job in so hurtful a manner." DEL.]—בַּלַּע, to destroy, to ruin [literally, to swallow up]; see ch. viii. 18; x. 8; xxxvii. 20); applied here to the crushing destruction of Job's outward prosperity. Not without reason does Jehovah make choice of these strong expressions, בלע here, הסית just before; for "Satan's aim went beyond the limited power which was given him over Job." DEL. Comp. our remarks above on ch. i. 12. [The lofty Divine irony of Jehovah's language should not be overlooked, contrasting as it does so strongly with Satan's baffled malignity and arrogant, scoffing unbelief. Schultens justly remarks: Ut in verbis Satanæ *jactantia*, ita in Dei responso *irrisio* se exerit.—E.]

Ver. 4. *Skin for skin.*—A proverbial expression, the independent meaning of which is obscure, and can be ascertained only from the connection. Now the following sentence, "all that a man hath will he give for his life," is evidently parallel in sense, as appears from the repetition of בְּעַד, "about," here "for, instead of" (as in Is. xxxii. 14; comp. the same use of תַּחַת in Ex. xxi. 23-25, and so frequently). It is therefore simply the application of the proverb to Job's case. The meaning of the phrase therefore, it would seem, must be this: A man will give like for like; of two things having about equal value he will willingly let the one go, that he may save the other; and this in fact, Satan suggests, Job had done; he had willingly given up all that was his, in order to save his own life and his bodily health. Job's property therefore is here represented as a skin, with which his person was covered, an integument

enveloping him for protection and comfort (comp. ch. xviii. 13; xix. 26, where עוֹר designates the entire body, the whole person corporeally considered). His physical life is represented as another such a skin. Of these two skins or integuments, the one of which lies nearer to him than the other, and is therefore dearer to him and more indispensable, he has surrendered the one, to wit, the outer, remoter, least necessary, in order to save and to retain the other. ["As is said in the proverb: Like for like; so it is with man: all for life." Hirz. "A proverbial saying, to the effect: A man freely parts with an external good, if he may thereby keep possession of another. So Job can well bear the loss of children and property, since the dearest earthly good, life and health, are left him." Vaih. So Ges., Dillm., Hengst., Con., Dav., *etc.*] This interpretation is beyond question the one best suited to the context, and is to be preferred to the others which have been proposed, *viz.: a.* That of the Targ., of several Rabbis, Schlott., and Del.—"A man will give a part of the skin, or a member, in order to preserve another part of the skin, or member; much more will a man give up all that he has to keep his life." This explanation is at fault in taking עוֹר, which always means the *whole* skin or hide, for a member or a part of the skin.—*b.* That of Ephraem, Rosenm., Hupf., in which עוֹר is used in respect of the lost children and animals to designate their life, their existence. [According to this view the full expression would be: skin (of another) for skin (of oneself), as "life for life" in Ex. xxi. 23; skin being used metaphorically for the body, or the life. The thought accordingly is: The bodies or the lives of others one will part with for his own.—The objection to this view is that the two equivalents, or the two things compared here, are not so much what is another's, and what is one's own, but rather one's own property and one's own life, or person.—Good's explanation: "'Skin for skin' is, in plain English, 'property for person,' or the 'skin forming property for the skin forming person,'" is correct as to the application, but as an explanation of the proverb it is faulty in that it injects too much of the special application into the body of the proverb.—E.] *c.* The interpretation of Olshausen, who refers to ver 5, and explains "skin for skin" to mean "as thou treatest him, so he will treat thee; so long as thou leavest his (skin, *i. e.,*) person untouched, so long will he not assail (thy skin, *i. e.,*) thee in person." This, however, is at variance alike with the connection and with decorum. ["Though it is the devil who speaks, this were nevertheless too unbecomingly expressed." Del. In addition to the above explanations, the following deserve mention: *d.* That of Parkhurst, Schult., Wem., who render the clause: Skin after skin, or skin upon skin; *i. e.,* to save his life a man would willingly be flayed over and over. This is unnatural in itself, a doubtful rendering of the preposition, and at variance with the analogous use of the same preposition in the following clause. Any explanation which requires a different use of the preposition in both clauses is certainly to be rejected. *e.* The view of Umbreit, who while agreeing with the explanation given above of the clause: skin for skin, explains differently its relation to the following clause. The proverb he regards as a mercantile one, meaning, one thing for another, everything is exchangeable in the market, any *external* good may be bartered for another; but life is an *internal* good of such value that nothing will buy it, and a man will sacrifice everything for it. His translation accordingly is: "Skin for skin; *but* all that a man hath he gives for his life." This, however, is much less simple and natural than to regard the וְ as connective, and the second clause as the application of the first. Especially decisive against it is the adversative אוּלָם at the beginning of ver. 5, which on Umbreit's theory would be deprived of all force. *f.* Merx in his version substitutes for the oriental proverb the German: Das Hemd sitzt näher als der Rock (The shirt is nearer than the coat), and explains: "One skin envelopes another skin; the first (goods and children) has been taken away from Job, he must yet be stripped of the second (health)." He maintains that בְּעַד never signifies "for, instead;" but he is condemned out of his own mouth, for in the very next clause he translates בְּעַד נַפְשׁוֹ "*for* his life!" While it may be granted that בְּעַד is not exactly synonymous with תַּחַת, either may be appropriately rendered by "for," the former corresponding rather to the Greek περί, or ὑπὲρ, the latter to ἀντι. "Although it does not stand for the ב of price, it nevertheless can, like תחת in Ex. xxi. 23-25, be used with the verb נתן in the sense of "instead," especially when the accessory notion 'for the protection of' is retained in connection with it." Dillm. The use of skin as the representative of value in the proverb is explained by the extent to which it was used as an article of utility and traffic. It was useful in itself and as a medium of exchange. Hence "skin for skin" would naturally mean "value for value."—E.]

Ver. 5. **But put forth now Thy hand, and touch his bone and his flesh.**—אוּלָם, verum enim vero, but verily, as in ch. i. 11. [The connection of the two verses is as follows: Value for value; a man's life is worth everything, and all that he has he will give up to save his life. *But*—touch that, put his life in peril, so that nothing that he has, or can do will save it, and assuredly he will curse thee. A simple statement of the connection is all that is necessary to refute some of the erroneous interpretations of the passage.—E.] נָגַע, to touch (in ch. i. 11 construed with בְּ) is here followed by אֶל. It is going too far, however, to assume, with Delitzsch, that this "expresses increased malignity: stretch forth Thy hand but once to his very bones," *etc.* [Hengst. agrees with Hupfeld that here "the bone" is specially mentioned as in Pss. vi. 3 (2); xxxviii. 4 (3); li. 10 (8) as the basis of the body and of its condition, as the inmost seat and source of vital power and sensibility." Note the peculiar metaphorical use of עֶצֶם in Hebrew for self, self-same.—Add also

that the collocation of bone and flesh in Hebrew is in almost every instance expressive of a man's *very self*, his essential personality. Comp. Gen. ii. 23; Judg. ix. 2; Job x. 11; Prov. xiv. 30. Satan's words here accordingly mean more than: touch his body; they mean: touch *him;* strike him in the vital parts of his being.—**Verily, he will curse Thee to Thy face.**—As in ch. i. 11. Satan, it will be noted, is more truly Satanic in this scene than in the former. As Dav. finely observes: "In his former aspersion of Job he had only hinted that Job's religion was not very genuine; it was profitable, and therefore carefully attended to. Here he goes a great way deeper, and maligns human nature in its very humanity. Man is not only irreligious (except for profit), but he is inhuman; what is usually regarded as possessions of the most irreligious men, love of kind and kindred, the deeper affections of family on which so much fine sentiment has been expended—they are matters of profit too. Man cares little for friend or family, only he be safe himself: put forth Thy hand and touch his own bone and flesh, and his viperish nature will rise like the trodden serpent, and disown Thee to Thy face." The essence of sin in its ordinary human manifestation is to be unable to live from any higher motive than self; its essence in the life of Satan is to be unable to *conceive* of any higher motive than self. The spirit of evil in man often makes virtue tributary to self; the spirit of evil in Satan takes the very constancy of virtue as proof only of more intense selfishness. The devil's logic in the case of Job: the more steadfast Job seems to be, the more inhuman must he be.—E.]

Ver. 6. **Behold he is in thy hand, only spare his life.**—Comp. ch. i. 12. נֶפֶשׁ is to be distinguished from חַיִּים; it denotes not the life-function, as such, which belongs to man as a spiritual and corporeal being, but its seat and medium, the soul (ψυχή, anima). But as above in ver. 4, so here, it must be rendered "life" [the term "soul" with us not being the exact equivalent of the above Hebrew, Greek, and Latin terms.—E.] Comp. the like use of ψυχή in Acts xx. 10, and elsewhere often in the New Testament.—שְׁמֹר, lit.: "beware of, abstain from;" *i. e.*, take care that in imperiling his life by the infliction of painful disease, thou dost not deprive him of it.

6. (β) *The fulfillment of the decree in Job's terrible disease:* vers. 7, 8.

Ver. 7. **Then Satan went out** . . . (comp. ch. i. 12) . . . **and smote Job with sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown**; *i. e.*, over his whole body.—Comp. the description of the same frightful disease given in almost the very same words in Deut. xxviii. 35.—שְׁחִין [singular collective], used in Lev. xiii. 18 sq., of the boils of a leper, and elsewhere of the carbuncles of the plague, refers here, as its use with the strengthening attributive רָע shows, to the worst form of leprosy, the *Lepra Arabica*,* or *Elephantiasis*, called also *lepra nodosa*, or *tuberculosa*, on account of the frightful swollen pustules, or boils, which make the limbs of the sufferer, and especially the lower extremities, look like the lumpy, apparently jointless limbs of the elephant [also perhaps "from its rendering the skin, like that of the elephant's, scabrous and dark-colored, and furrowed all over with tubercles." GOOD]. By the Arabians it is named *gudhâm*, the mutilating disease, because in its extreme stages entire members gradually fall away, such as fingers, teeth, hands, *etc.* Once in the Old Testament it is described as שְׁחִין מִצְרַיִם, "the Egyptian ulcer" (Deut. xxviii. 27). It is not limited, however, to Arabia and Egypt, but prevails also in the East Indies, inclusive of the Sunda Islands, and likewise in the West Indies, and even in the countries of Northern Europe, as in Norway, where it rages at times with fearful violence, often seizing on entire villages. It is not only contagious (according to the testimony of the ancients, *e. g.*, of Aretäus, the Cappadocian, it might be communicated by the mere breathing of the person diseased), but in many cases it also transmits itself from parents to children. [Dillman remarks that according to the most recent observations it does not seem to be contagious. So also the article on Medicine in Smith's Bible Dict. says: "It is hereditary and may be inoculated, but does not propagate itself by the closest contact."—E.] Finally, it is, as a rule, incurable; or at all events one of the most tedious diseases, protracting itself through twenty years or more. The identity of this disease with Job's affliction was maintained long ago by Origen (c. Cels. vi. 5), and is held by all modern expositors. This view is supported by the symptoms of the disease as they are further given in our book: the insufferable itching of the skin (ch. ii. 8); the skin cracking, and covered with boils now hard and crustated, and now festering (ch. vii. 5); the stinking breath (ch. xix. 17); the blackened and chapped appearance of the body caused by inward heat in the bones (ch. xxx. 30); the danger of the limbs falling away (ch. xxx. 17, 30); the extreme emaciation of the body (ch. xix. 20; xxx. 18); the anguished frame, made restless by nightly dreams, gaspings and tortures (ch. vii. 4, 13-15; xxx. 17), *etc.* [" It first appears in general, but not always, about the face, as an indurated nodule (hence it is improperly called tubercular), which gradually enlarges, inflames, and ulcerates. Sometimes it commences in the neck or arms. The ulcers will heal spontaneously, but only after a long period, and after destroying a great deal of the neighboring parts. If a joint be attacked, the ulceration will go on till its destruction is complete, the joints of finger, toe, *etc.*, dropping off one by one. Frightful dreams and fetid breath are symptoms mentioned by some pathologists. More nodules will develop themselves; and if the face be the chief seat of the disease, it assumes a leonine aspect (hence called also Leontiasis), loathsome and hideous; the skin becomes thick, rugose, and livid; the eyes are fierce and staring, and the hair gene-

* According to the author of the art. Medicine in Smith's Bible Dict. there is still another disease called *Elephantiasis Arabum*, quite distinct from the disease which afflicted Job, which is known as the *Elephantiasis Græcorum*.

rally falls off from all the parts affected. When the throat is attacked the voice shares the affection, and sinks to a hoarse, husky whisper."—Art. *Medicine* in Smith's Bib. Dict. See also art. *Leper*]. Comp. below on ch. vii. 14; also the more particular description of the disease by Aretäus the Cappadocian (translated by Mann, 1858, p. 221; comp. also Del., Vol. I., p. 70, n. Clark's For. The. Lib.); J. D. Michaelis, *Einleitung ins A. T.*, I. 57 sq.; Winer, *Real-Wörterbuch*, I. 115 sq. (3d Ed.); Friedrich, *Z. Bibel*, 1848, I. 193 sq.; Hecker, *Elephantiasis*, oder *Lepra Arabica*, Lahr, 1838; Heer, *De elephantiasi Græcorum et Arabum;* Danielson and Boeck, *Traité de la Spédalskhed, ou Elephantiasis des Grecs*, a work published at the expense of the Government of Norway, Paris, 1848; Virchow, *Die krankhaften Geschwülste*, Vol. II. 1, Berlin, 1863 (which treats with especial minuteness of the distinction frequently overlooked between the Eleph. Græcorum and the Eleph. Arabum); also the narratives of travelers, *e. g.*, Bruce, and recently of Bickmore (an American traveler in the East Indies), who, after giving a harrowing description of a village in northern Sumatra filled with sufferers from elephantiasis, declares with a shudder that one who has never seen such cases of leprosy can form no conception of the distortions which the human body can assume, and still live.

Ver. 8. **And he took him a potsherd to scrape himself withal.**—The modern Orientals, when suffering from the same disease, make use of instruments prepared for scraping, made out of ivory or other material (comp. Cleric. on the passage). ["Scraping with a potsherd will not only relieve the intolerable itching of the skin, but also remove the matter." DEL.] **And he sat down among the ashes**: lit.: "and he was sitting (at the time) in the midst of the ashes;" or "while he sat in the midst of the ashes." [So most of the recent commentators. The participial construction וְהוּא יֹשֵׁב describing the condition of the subject at the time of the affirmation in the principal verb. Comp. Gen. xix. 1; Judg. xiii. 9; and see Ewald, Gr. § 168, 2 and § 341, a. Schlott. finds in this clause evidence, that but a short time intervened between the former trial and the present. While he was yet sitting in ashes, mourning the loss of his children, he was smitten in his own person.—E.] Sitting in the ashes is certainly the attitude of a mourner (comp. ch. xlii. 6; Jerem. vi. 26; Jon. iii. 6); but in this case, the attitude is occasioned not only by the loss of his children, but more especially by the new calamity which has befallen the sufferer. The LXX. enlarges upon the description in accordance with the Levitical law touching leprosy, as well as such passages as Ps. cxiii. 7: *Καὶ ἐκάθητο ἐπὶ τῆς κοπρίας ἔξω τῆς πόλεως*. There is nothing in the Heb. text here to indicate the segregation of Job in his leprosy. Still it cannot be doubted, especially in view of ver. 12 (see notes), that even as a non-Israelite, as an inhabitant of Haurân *e. g.*, he was required to submit to such separation Comp. the information given by Wetstein in Del. (ii. 152), concerning the dung-heaps, the *mezbele* before the villages of Haurân, and the occupation of the same by lepers. ["The dung is brought in a dry state in baskets to the place before the village, and is generally burnt once every month. . . . The ashes remain. . . . If a village has been inhabited for a century, the *mezbele* reaches a height which far surpasses it. The winter rains make the ash-heaps into a compact mass, and gradually change the *mezbele* into a firm mound of earth. . . . The *mezbele* serves the inhabitants of the district as a watch-tower, and on close, oppressive evenings as a place of assembly, because there is a current of air on the height. There the children play about the whole day long; there the forsaken one lies, who, having been seized by some horrible malady, is not allowed to enter the dwellings of men, by day asking alms of the passers-by, and at night hiding himself among the ashes, which the sun has warmed. There the dogs of the village lie, perhaps gnawing at a decaying carcase that is frequently thrown there. WETZST.

7. (γ) *Job's Steadfastness in Piety. Vers.* 9, 10.

Ver. 9. **Then said his wife unto him.**—[The Chald. here gives the name of Job's wife as Dinah, a trace of the old tradition that Job was contemporary with Jacob. The Sept. and Copt. contain a considerable addition to the text in the form of a lengthened and impassioned discourse by Job's wife, detailing his sorrows and her own.—E.] In place of Satan, who, from ver. 6 on, disappears from the book's history, Job's own wife now appears against him to tempt him, to be, as it were, an *adjutrix diaboli* (Augustine). **Dost thou still hold fast to thine integrity?**—עֹדְךָ וגו׳, a question implying astonishment, although without a particle of interrogation (Ew. § 324, a). Compare the question which Anna, the wife of Tobias, that apocryphal copy of Job's wife, addresses to her blinded husband: *ποῦ εἰσὶν αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου καὶ αἱ δικαιοσύναι σου, ἰδοὺ γνωστὰ πάντα μετὰ σοῦ* ["*i. e.* as Sengelmann and Fritzsche correctly explain, one sees from thy misfortunes that thy virtue is not of much avail to thee." DEL.] **—Renounce God and die!**—ברך אלהים evidently in the bad sense of ch. i. 11; ii. 5; and thus equivalent to: "let God go, renounce thy allegiance to Him, give up at last praising and trusting Him, since verily nothing more remains for thee but to die!" Hahn takes ברך here *sensu bono:* "Praise God all the time, thou shall presently see what thy reward is, even death!" [So Ges. Lex.: "Bless and praise God as thou wilt, yet thou must now die; thy piety towards God is in vain." Carey, Con.: "The import of this taunting reproach I take to be: Bless God (if you will), and die! for that is all it will profit you."] But to this stands opposed the sharp rejoinder which Job makes in ver. 10 to his wife, from which it may be clearly inferred, that on the present occasion she was to him, if not altogether a "*Proserpina et Furia infernalis*" (Calv.), still, in some measure, a *μάστιξ τοῦ διαβόλου* (Chrysost.), to scourge him severely, an "instrument of the Tempter" (Ebr.). [Another argument against taking ברך in the sense of

"blessing" is brought forward by Hengst., to wit, that the words bear an unmistakable relation to the saying of Satan, twice repeated: Verily he will renounce Thee to Thy face. The wife is Satan's instrument in the endeavor to secure the fulfilment of that prediction. It may be still further suggested, that the *spirit* which manifestly prompted the first words of the wife seems more in harmony with the rendering "renounce." She begins by expressing her astonishment, an astonishment evidently accompanied by deep indignation, that after such heavy blows Job should still *hold fast* to his integrity. Nothing could be more natural than to find her in the same breath vehemently urging Job to *relinquish* his integrity by "bidding farewell" to God.—E]

Ver. 10. **Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaketh.**—Folly here in the well-known Old Testament sense of godlessness, impiousness (Ps. xiv. 1), or in the sense of that saying of Luther's: "All those who are without the Holy Ghost, however wise they may be esteemed by the world in temporal affairs, power or business, before God they are fools or blind men." ["The translation 'as one of the foolish women' does not correspond to the Hebrew; נָבָל is one who thinks madly and acts impiously." Del. "נְבָלָה means not simply a woman without understanding, but one who is a fool, who refuses to know more of God, who is an atheist, or a heathen." Dillm.] The reproof is thus a severe one; at the same time, the אַחַת "one, any one," has that in it which somewhat softens its severity: comp. 2 Sam. xiii. 13. ["Job does not say to his wife: Thou art a foolish woman; but: Thou speakest as if thou didst belong to that class; thou art become unlike thyself." Hengst.] **Shall we receive the good from God, and shall we not also receive the evil?**—The question consists of two members: the גַּם, standing at the beginning (instead of which we might have expected the more exact הֲגַם), "belongs logically to the second part, towards which the voice should hurry in reading the first part, which contains the premise of the other: this is frequently the case after interrogative particles, *e. g.*, Num. xvi. 22; Isa. v. 46." Del. For this anticipation of the גַּם, which has its logical connection with a later clause, comp. below ch. xv. 10; Hos. vi. 11; Zech. ix. 11; also the analogous syntactical construction of אַף, אַךְ, רַק. [Hence the rendering of גַּם by "What?" (E. V) is inaccurate. "The first division of the verse is translated by Ges., Ew (Hupf., Dillm., Ren), and some others affirmatively, and the second division interrogatively. Thes. I , p 294, *bonum accepimus a Deo, nonne etiam malum suscipiamus?* . . . But the Heb. has the same form in both divisions; and the interrogative tone in both is a far more spirited expression of the thought." Con.] The word קִבֵּל, "to receive" is found elsewhere in prose only in the post-exilic literature, and in Aramaic. Its appearance here, however, should not greatly surprise us, as we meet with it in proverbial poetry. Prov. xix. 20. [It is worthy of note as a fine exhibition of the sympathetic genius of the author, that whereas in ch. i. 21 he uses the name Jehovah, here he uses the name Elohim. There the religious consciousness of Job, deeply stirred by his losses, but realizing nevertheless the full blessedness of uninterrupted communion with God, and pouring itself forth in that sublime soliloquy which is for all ages the doxology of the chastised believer, seizes on that name which to the Old Testament saint most fully expressed in his eternal perfections and glory on the one side, and in his personal relations to man on the other. Here the same consciousness, deep, genuine, unfaltering as ever, but striving on the one hand to maintain itself against the depressing influence of physical ill, on the other hand to repel the daring suggestion of atheistical folly, consecrated as the suggestion was through Satanic skill by all the associations which love had sealed upon the lips that spoke it, seizes on that name of the Supreme Being which most fully expresses his power over the forces of nature, and which most effectually silences the sneer of the godless heart. There Job speaks rather as the chastised *child*, in the attitude of *benediction*, blessing the name of *Jehovah;* here he speaks rather as the chastised *creature*, in the attitude of *resignation*, vindicating the ways of *Elohim.*—E.]—**In all this did not Job sin with his lips.**—Compare the similar judgment rendered by the poet at the conclusion of the first trial, ch. i. 22. That Job has thus far escaped all sin of the lips (comp. ch. xxvii. 4; Pss. xxxiv. 14 (13); lix. 8 (7); cxl. 4 (3); Prov. xxiv. 2, *etc.*), is here emphasized indeed only by way of contrast with the violent expressions which soon follow, which he was provoked to utter by the three friends, and in which he assuredly did sin. The intimation that he had already sinned *in his thoughts* (Targ., Diedrich), is scarcely conveyed by the בִּשְׂפָתָיו, however true in itself the remark of Delitzsch: "The temptation to murmur was now already at work within him, but he was its master, so that no murmur escaped him."

8. *The visit of the friends, and their mute sympathy, as an immediate preparation for the action of the poem*, vers. 11-13.

Ver. 11. **Then Job's three friends heard of all this evil that was come upon him.**—[The question whether the article should be used with "friends" cannot be determined with absolute certainty, the form of expression in the Hebrew being ambiguous, and the circumstances not being fully known. By some (Dav., Con., Ren., Elz.) it is omitted, although by most it is recognized; and this on the whole seems best. Although there is nothing to justify the Sept. in describing these friends as kings, there is good reason for regarding them as persons of universal consideration by virtue of their station, their age, and their wisdom. Comp. ch. xii. 3; xiii. 2; xv. 17 sq.; xviii. 3; and Elihu's remarks in ch. xxxii. See also below on Eliphaz. And the *concerted* demonstration which they here make of their sympathy with Job would show that they were his friends in a peculiar sense. For these reasons the rendering "*the* three friends of Job"

is to be preferred.—E.] הַבָּאָה, as accentuated, is not the *partic. fem.*, but the *perf.* with the art. which stands in place of the *rel. pron.*, as in Gen. xviii. 21; xlvi. 27. [Ewald, however, justly criticizes the Masora in these and other passages on the ground that the partic. can just as well be assumed in them, and is besides the more obvious construction. See Gr., p. 802, n. 1.—E.] That which is here related is to be understood as taking place not at the very beginning of Job's sickness, but some months later (comp. ch. vii. 3), when the disease had made considerable progress, producing loathsome disfigurement of his person (comp. ver. 12; ch. vii. 4 seq.; ch. xix. ch. xxx.)—**And they came each from his own place.**—These places where they lived, which are mentioned in the sequel only in the most general way as countries, or regions of country, are not to be regarded as situated in each other's immediate vicinity. The place where they came to, the object of וַיָּבֹאוּ, is to be thought of as some other place than that where Job lived. From this, their appointed rendezvous, they then proceeded to Job's abode, to testify to him their sympathy (this being the meaning of לָנוּד, comp. ch. xlii. 11, also נִיד, sympathy, ch. xvi. 5), and to comfort him.—**Eliphaz the Temanite,** *etc.*—Since Eliphaz (אֱלִיפַז) appears also in Gen. xxxvi. 4, 10, 12, as an old Idumean name of a person, there can be no doubt that his country, Teman (תֵּימָן), a name which also occurs in Gen. xxxvi. 11, 15, in close connection with that of Eliphaz, is to be identified with the Idumean region of that name, whose inhabitants, not only according to our poem, but also according to the testimony of other Scripture writers, such as Jeremiah (ch. xlix. 7) and Baruch (ch. iii. 22 seq.), were particularly celebrated for their wisdom comp. also Obad. viii. 9; also the בְּנֵי בִין, *i. e.*, sons of knowledge, of wisdom, in (Macc. v. 4). We are scarcely to understand by it the Têmâ of East Hauran (which indeed may possibly be a colony of the Edomite Theman). As for the countries of the two other friends, Shuah (שׁוּחַ), the home of Bildad, is to be sought for somewhere in the eastern part of North Arabia, among the settlements of the Keturäites, one of whom is called Shuah, Gen. xxv. 2. The application of the name to Schakka, beyond Hauran, the Σακκαία of Ptolem., ch. v. 15, is doubtful on account of the difference in sound of the names. [According to Carey it is identical with the *Saiace* of Pliny (vi. 32), now called *Sekiale*, or *El Saiak* about midway between the Elamitic Gulf and the mouth of the Euphrates]. Naamah, finally, must be one of the many Syrian regions of that name; it can hardly be the city of that name in the *Shefelah*, mentioned Josh. xv. 41. When out of a נַעֲמָתִי the LXX. makes out Zophar a Μιναῖος (or Μαυναῖος, so Aristæus, in Euseb. Præp. Ev. ix. 25), it probably follows a tradition which pointed to Maon (now Mâân), lying East of Petra, as his home.—Again, as regards the etymology of the names of the three friends, it may be conjectured that אֱלִיפַז means the man to whom "God is his joy;" בִּלְדַּד, "the son of strife" (לדד, in Arab. to strive, to wrangle); צוֹפַר, perhaps "the twitterer" (*i. e.*, צִפּוֹר, from צפר, to pipe, to twitter). So Gesenius—Dietrich in their smaller dictionary; while Delitzsch, *e. g.*, adopts entirely different definitions: thus אֱלִיפַז=*cui Deus aurum est*, comp. ch. xxii. 25, also the name Phasael, formed by transposition; so also Michaelis, Suppl. p. 87. Fürst: "El is dispenser of riches;" Ges. in Lex.: "God his strength"]: בְּלִי דַד=בלדד, *sine mammis*, one brought up without his mother's milk; צוֹפַר=*el—asfar*, "the yellow," *flavedo*. Comp. Abulfeda's *Hist. ante-islamica*, Ed. Fleischer, p. 168 [Fürst: "The shaggy, or rough"]. The two latter names, being just those in respect to which the suspicion that they are a poetic invention could be in some measure justified, do not appear elsewhere in the Old Testament. [**And they had made an appointment together to come,** *etc.*; or more correctly: They met together by appointment; the proper meaning of the Niph. נוֹעַד being, as Del. and Dillm. point out, not to appoint a place for meeting (which would be נוֹעַץ rather), but to meet in an appointed place at an appointed time.—E.]

Ver. 12. **And they raised their eyes afar off, and knew him not.**—Two things may be inferred from these words: (1) That Job was now staying not in his own house, but out of doors, in a place which furnished miserable shelter, serving as a retreat for lepers; comp. on ver. 8 above [and especially the extract from Wetst. concerning the *mezbele*]; and (2) that the disease had already disfigured him so that he could not be recognized (comp. notes on ver. 7).—**And sprinkled dust upon their heads toward heaven.**—In addition to the weeping and the rending of their mantles, these words describe a third and a particularly violent symbol and expression of their sympathizing grief. Gathering up the dust they fling it into the air, *i. e.*, "toward heaven," until it falls back upon their heads; thus indicating that by a heavenly, a Divine dispensation, they felt themselves to be bowed down to the dust in sorrow (comp. Ezek. xxvii. 30; Lam. ii. 10, *etc.*)

Ver. 13. **And they sat down with him upon the earth seven days and seven nights**; *i. e.* as the sequel shows, *in silence*, and also without doubt *fasting*. This impressive demonstration of sympathizing sorrow reminds us, not of the seven days' lamentation for Saul (1 Sam. xxxi. 13), but rather of Ezekiel's mourning, when he sat down for seven days astonished among the captives by the river Chebar (Ez. iii. 15). To lay stress on the number seven as rigidly historical is inadmissible in view of the poetic ideal character of the description. At the same time, the statement contains nothing impossible or improbable, nothing at variance with customs and modes of thought which are known to prevail in the east, especially among oriental sages, with whom moreover, ascetic practices are always to be associated. Their "sitting down upon the ground"

still further characterizes them as mourners in all they did; comp. 2 Sam. xii. 16; Ezek. xxvi. 16; Lam. ii. 10.—**And none spake a word unto him**: lit. "without one (וְאֵין דֹּבֵר) speaking to him a word." This silence is to be understood as absolute—not as interrupted by occasional speech among themselves ["This seven days' silence has been thought improbable, and it has been sought in various ways to modify the statement. A great mistake. For it is to be borne in mind that what is observable in the well-known phenomena of mystical absorption in the East is, in a less exaggerated form, a universal characteristic of orientals. Rest as well as motion has with them more positive power than with us—a trait which Hamann, in the beginning of one of his most genial writings (the *Æsthetica in nuce*), mentions as characteristic of the primeval world of humanity: "The rest of our ancestors was a profounder sleep; and their motion a reeling dance. Seven days they would sit in the stillness of meditation; and then they would open their mouth for winged sayings.'" SCHLOTT.] The reason for the friends' silence is given by the poet in the explanatory clause which follows: **For they saw that the affliction was very great**; *i. e.* they observed that Job's painful condition, including the disease and the misery which caused it (כְּאֵב here accordingly not in a one-sided subjective sense, but also the objective sense of affliction, malady), was far too great to admit of their endeavoring to comfort him simply by words. It is therefore the overpowering sight of the nameless misery which has seized upon their friend that closes their mouth; although to this must be added the influence of the erroneous assumption, which controlled all of them, that Job's terrible suffering had been occasioned by certain secret sins, the existence of which they had not before suspected, and which they had never deemed him capable of committing. And the fact that this erroneous assumption, which led them to look on their friend not only as one who was sorely afflicted, but as one who had fallen, lay at the bottom of their persistent mournful silence, and was even to be read on their countenances, must have made their presence to the sorely tried sufferer the more painful the longer it continued. And so their visit, which was undertaken according to ver. 11 with the most loving intent, became, without their purposing it, a severe trial of his feelings (comp. vi. 14 sq., especially ver. 24)—a trial which at length affected him more powerfully, and became more insupportable to him than all former ones, driving him at last into that passionate and intemperate outbreak, which even the lamenting and doubting challenge of his wife had failed to call forth. Comp. Vilmar (*Past. Theol. Blätt.* xi. 69): "The temptation of Job becomes efficient by means of his friends. First of all, by their presence they cause his attention to be drawn exclusively to his own misery, and then by their reproaches they draw out from him, one after the other, the maintenance of his own innocence, his complaint because of the cruel misunderstanding of his friends, his dispute with them, and finally his dispute with God." ["Thus a new trial awaits Job, one in which he cannot stand aloof from men, and go through in the secresy of his own soul—fighting his dark adversaries alone, and conquering and becoming strong in his solitude: his conflict this time is with men, with the best and most religious of men, and with the loftiest creed his time has heard of. It is a tremendous conflict; when a man stands alone, with all parties and forms of faith and thought, and even the world, or outward God, against him, and only himself and strong conscience, and his necessary thoughts of the unseen God and instinctive personal faith in Him as his helpers. It does not appear what place, if any, Satan holds in this new conflict; his name disappears from the book. We cannot say, whether he silently acknowledged himself baffled and retired, having done his worst on Job, and so this new trial, not of his contriving, but of God's, who will by its means bring Job to fuller knowledge of Himself that he may be at peace; and if so, how infinitely deeper is God's knowledge of us than Satan's, and with what unspeakably profounder skill he can touch the deepest springs of our nature, and so get behind, do what Satan will, all his possible contrivances, for greater is He that is in us than he that is in the world—or whether we are to understand this new fire to be also of the devil's kindling. We prefer to have done with him, and view the remaining portion of Job's exercise as between him and God alone, who, though the devil failed, and retired in confusion, will yet display to the universe more wondrous strength and more marvellously the talismanic touch of the divine hand upon the human heart. It seems so; much of the poem is monologue, the objections and interpellations of the friends are but used by God as spurs to stimulate the soul to exercise itself on him. No one can doubt the divine wisdom in using the friends to bring Job into fuller knowledge of itself; the violence of human dialectic and the many-sidedness of several minds presented before Job in much greater completeness all the phases of his relation to heaven than could have been accomplished by the mere workings of his own mind." DAV.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The feature of the preceding Section of our book of greatest interest to the reader who would thoroughly investigate the Scriptures both from the speculative, doctrinal and ethical point of view, as well as from the apologetic, centre predominantly, indeed we may say exclusively, is the enigmatic figure of Satan.—The "Satan of the Prologue" is the standing theme of certain introductory chapters, or of elaborate dissertations in most of the modern Commentaries on Job, both critical and apologetic. The following are the fundamental questions treated in this connection: Can we and should we assume a personal intermediate cause out of the circle of the highest created existences, that is, a mighty fallen angel, to account for that which is sinful in the actions and motives of mankind in general? Again: Should we attribute to this evil spirit, even within the sphere

of the external life of nature and humanity, operations which produce ruin and destruction, thus exhibiting him as a cause, not only of moral evil, but, in a qualified sense, also of physical evil on earth? Again: May we assume that like the good angels, he has access to God's throne, and so has, as it were, a place and a voice, or, at any rate, certain ministerial functions in the councils of heaven? Finally—and this is, after those more general questions, that which specially relates to the peculiarities of the Satanology of the Book of Job—Can we assign the name, the functions, the whole appearance of Satan as the personal principle of evil, or, in a word, as the Adversary, to that more remote antiquity of the theocratic development, to which so many indications point as the most probable time to which to refer the composition of this book? Or are we constrained to regard the whole conception of Satan as the product only of a later development, say of a biblico-theological development moulded by influences proceeding from the Assyrian Babylon, or the Persians, and accordingly to bring down the composition, if not of the entire book, at least of the Prologue (together with the Epilogue, comp. Introd. § 8), into a later age, subsequent not only to the time of Moses, but even to that of Solomon? With reference to the skeptical element which resides in each one of those questions, and at the same time with a view to obtaining a more concise and simple treatment of the same, the question may be put thus: whether the Satan of the Book of Job is to be rejected—(1) on *religious and moral* grounds, as the product of a dualistic mythology, antagonistic to a pure monotheism, or (2) on *physico-theological* grounds as a superstition; or (3) on *æsthetic* grounds as a pure poetic fiction; or (4) on grounds derived from the *history of revelation*, as a scriptural and theological anachronism.

1. The theory that there is a Satan cannot be rejected on *religious* and *moral* grounds, for the entire Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments demonstrate the existence of such a being; never, however, in the dualistic sense of the religion of the Zend [Avesta], as an evil principle, absolutely and from eternity opposing the good God, but always as a relative or created evil principle, as an angel or spirit which had been created good by God, but which had afterwards fallen through its own criminal wickedness. *As a matter of fact*, this created evil principle—to the actual existence of which no one testifies more frequently, strongly, and emphatically than our Lord Himself in His discourses as recorded in the Gospels (the synoptical alike with that of John)—meets us already in the oldest book of the Bible, in Genesis, where the account given of the origin of sin (ch. iii.) so unmistakably presents the evil spirit, disguised as a serpent, as the author of sin in the development of humanity, that every attempt to explain the serpent as pure "allegory," or a "mere hieroglyph," runs off into absurdity. Not less do we find this same evil principle, if not by name, at least in fact, in the Azazel of Leviticus (ch. xvi. 3 seq., 27), that "personification of abstract impurity as opposed to the absolute purity of Jehovah," as Roskoff (*Gesch. des Teufels*, Bd. I., Leipzig, 1869) has perhaps not unsuitably defined him, as well as in the description, resembling our Prologue, given by the prophet Micah the elder in 1 Kings xxii. 21 seq., where הָרוּחַ, "the spirit" simply, is used to designate the *evil* spirit only because hitherto humanity had to trace everywhere mainly the operation of *this* spirit, the liar and murderer from the beginning, whereas of the *Spirit* in the highest and truest sense of the word, the Holy Spirit of God (Joel iii. 1 [E. V., ii. 28], John iii. 34, *etc.*), it had learned as yet little or nothing. But also *by name* the Old Testament more than once already testifies to the existence of Satan, certain as it is that not only this Prologue, but also 1 Chron. xxi. 1 and Zech. iii. 1, apply this designation to the same being; in the passage in 1 Chron. as a peculiar proper name without the article, in Zechariah, as in our passage, as an appellative, and consequently with the article. The signification attaching to the word in each case, whether with or without the article, is simply "the Adversary" (שָׂטָן from שָׂטַם=שָׂטַן, to be hostile to, *adversari;* Job xvi. 9; xxx. 21), or also "the Accuser" (Ps. cix. 6). Comp. the New Testament equivalents ὁ διάβολος and ὁ κατήγως, Rev. xii. 10; likewise the cases where שָׂטָן denotes a human adversary or enemy, such as 1 Sam. xxix. 4; 2 Sam. xix. 23 [22]; 1 Kings v. 18 [4]; xi. 14-25; also Num. xxii. 22, 32, where a *good* angel of Jehovah, in so far as he obstructs Balaam on his way, is spoken of as his "Satan." This same signification, however, has in it nothing which in the slightest degree indicates an absolutely dualistic antagonism of Satan to God, and hence a character above that of a creature, or, in any sense, divine and eternal. And especially in this Prologue, which in any case, even if written after the time of Solomon, contains the earliest Biblical testimony to Satan's invisible agency in tempting men, does he appear as distinctly as possible as belonging to the class of created spirits, an angel like the angels or "sons of God" (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, ch. i. 6 seq.; xxxviii. 4 seq.; Gen. vi. 2; comp. Ps. xxix. 1; lxxxix. 7 [6], although indeed an angel possessed of an evil disposition, and guilty of evil actions, who in any case belongs to the same side with the angels who bring calamity and death (ch. xxxiii. 22; Ps. lxxviii. 49), and who, as an accuser of men, is engaged in doing just the opposite of that which is attributed to those who are spoken of in our book as "interceding" or "mediating" angels (ch. v. 1; xxxiii. 23 seq.). Nothing therefore can be more perverse or unhistorical than the attempt to represent the Satan of the Old Testament in general, and of our book in particular, as a Hebrew imitation, either of the Angramainyas—Ahriman of the Persians (so many of the earlier exegetes, also Umbreit, Renan, Hilgenfeld, Roskoff in the work cited above, Alex. Kohut: *Ueber die jüdische Angeologie und Dämonologie in ihrer Abhängigkeit vom Parsismus*, Leipzig, 1866), or of the Set-Typhon of the Egyptians (so Diestel in his Treatise concerning Set-Typhon, Azazel, and Satan, *Stud. u. Krit.*,

1860, II.), and so to maintain the original uncreatedness of the evil spirit, his dualistic coexistence with God from eternity.* It is certainly impossible to see how the theory of a tempter of men, a created being, coming forth out of the realm of evil spirits, the theory, *i. e.*, of a fallen angel as a personal principle of evil, and author of sin in humanity, does any violence to the purity of the religious consciousness, or the moral earnestness of men; or why it should be necessary to deny that Satan is "of purely Israelitish origin and a natural product of primitive Hebraism," and with Diestel (in the article referred to above), to maintain that "it would be no particular honor even for Israel to be able to claim him as its own, that he never had a proper footing in the Hebrew consciousness." Comp. Delitzsch, I. 57: "But how should it be no honor for Israel, the people to whom the revelation of redemption was made, and in whose history the plan of redemption was developed, to have traced the poisonous stream of evil up to the fountain of its first free beginning in the spiritual world, and to have more than superficially understood the history of the fall of mankind by sin, which points to a disguised superhuman power, opposed to the Divine will? This perception undoubtedly only begins gradually to dawn in the Old Testament; but in the New Testament the abyss of evil is fully disclosed, and Satan has so far a hold on the consciousness of Jesus, that He regards His life's vocation as a conflict with Satan. And the *Protevangelium* is deciphered in facts, when the promised seed of the woman crushed the serpent's head, but at the same time suffered the bruising of its own heel."

2. Again, the *physico-theological* ground, that such natural phenomena of a destructive character, as the ravages of lightning, storms, dire diseases, *etc.*, are to be referred directly to the agency of God as Ruler of the universe, and that we ascribe to the evil spirit far too wide a sphere for the exertion of his power, when we attribute such results to him—this position does not sustain the test of more searching inquiry in the light of God's Word. Not only does our book in that striking description which it gives of Job's calamities in ch. i. 13-18, and ch. ii. 7, introduce a whole series of such destructive natural agencies (two of which indeed are works of destruction accomplished by wild, godless men), referring the same to Satan as the intermediate instrument of a Divine decree, but the entire Scripture of the Old and New Testaments views all possible events of nature which are connected with the destinies of mankind, and all historical catastrophes, as brought about by the invisible agency of angelic powers, now of such as are good, and now of such as are evil. Whether man is preserved or injured, it represents either result in so far as man with his body belongs to the corporeal world, as accomplished by the agency of spirits (comp. v. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.*, I. 285 seq.). And in particular does it introduce angels as causing desolating wars and defeats (comp. Dan. x. 1 seq; Rev. ix. 14 seq.; xx. 8), also as letting loose the elements of destruction, such as fire, water, tempest, *etc.*, in general, therefore as active powers engaged in furthering the manifestations of Divine wrath, now expressly representing them as belonging to the kingdom of Satan, now leaving their moral character undetermined. This it does quite often; our passage is by no means the only one; comp. 1 Chron. xxi. 1 sq.; Rev. xiv. 15; xvi. 5, and often. So that Luther accordingly expresses no absurdly superstitious notion, but what is essentially only the purely theistic representation of the Holy Scriptures as apprehended by faith, when in the exposition of the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer in his Greater Catechism, he writes: "The devil causes brawls, murders, sedition and war, also thunderstorms, hail, to destroy grain and cattle, to poison the air, *etc.*" The extent of the sphere which Luther here, and in many other passages, especially in his "Table-talk about the devil" (*Werke*, Bd., 60), assigns to the agency of Satan in injuring and destroying life, may be altogether too wide; even as in like manner the Satanological and demonological representations of the earlier ages of the Church may need in many ways to be limited and corrected in accordance with the assured results of the modern natural sciences and philosophical investigation. But on the whole it still remains indisputable that he who denies to Satan any agency whatever in the sphere of nature, and allows him exclusively a moral influence upon the will, has removed himself far from the foundation of revealed truth, and for the Satan of the Bible, the "Prince of this world," who "has the power of death" (Heb. ii. 14), substitutes what is only a semi-personal Phantom-Satan, an abstraction of modern thought, the existence of which is problematical. Comp. Delitzsch (I. 63): "As among men, so in nature, since the fall two different powers of Divine anger and Divine love are in operation; the mingling of these is the essence of the present Kosmos. Everything destructive to nature, and everything arising therefrom which is dangerous and fatal to the life of man, is the outward manifestation of the power of anger. In this power Satan has fortified himself; and this, which underlies the whole course of nature, he is able to make use of, so far as God may permit it, as being subservient to His chief design (comp. Rev. xiii. 13 with 2 Thess. ii. 9). He has no creative power. Fire and storm, by means of which he works, are of God; but he is allowed to excite these forces to hostility against man, just as he himself is become an instrument of evil. It is similar with human demonocracy, whose very being consists in placing itself *en rapport* with the hidden powers of nature. Satan is the great magician, and has already manifested himself as such even in paradise, and in the temptation of Jesus Christ. There is in nature, as among men, an entanglement of contrary forces, which he knows how to unloose, because it is the sphere of his special dominion; for the whole course of nature in the change of its phenomena, is subject not only to

* Comp. that which has been advanced against this theory even by such liberally disposed investigators as Dillmann (p. 8) and Davidson (Introd. II, p. 199, 230 seq.); in like manner Max Müller's objections to the prevalent assumption of the identity of most of the religious traditions in the book of Genesis with those of the Zend Avesta (in his Essays, vol. I., p. 129 seq.).

abstract laws, but also to concrete supernatural powers, both bad and good."

3. Neither is the Satan of our book to be assailed on *æsthetic* grounds; for his appearance before God in the midst of the other angels has nothing at variance with the position which all the rest of the Scriptures assigns to the Evil Spirit in the administration of the world, or the economy of the Divine kingdom, nothing which favors the suspicion that we have to do here with the arbitrary product of an inventive fancy, without objective reality. Herder, Eichhorn, Ilgen, and others in a former age [and so Wemyss] denied that the Satan of these two chapters has a nature *decidedly evil*, and regarded him as being, in respect to his moral character, an impartial, judicial agent of God, a divinely authorized *censor morum*, who exhibits scarcely any the slightest traces, or traits of a personal evil principle. This theory, however, must be rejected, not only on account of the unmistakably evil disposition and conduct which our poet attributes to him, but also on account of the analogy of Zech. iii. 1 seq., a passage which not less decidedly than this in Job brings into connection these two facts: on the one hand that Satan's character is thoroughly bad and opposed to God, on the other that he has the right to appear before God among the angels. The same may be said of Umbreit's view: that the Satan of our poem is a creation of the poet's imagination, suggested by Ps. cix. 6 (*Die Sünde im Alten Testament*, 1853), as well as of those modern views generally, which find in the appearance of Satan among the holy "sons of God" in heaven anything singular, anything which contradicts what the Scripture teaches elsewhere concerning Satan (so *e. g.*, Ewald, and Lutz in his *Bibl. Dogmatik*, 1847). It is enough to oppose to these mythologizing attempts of a biased criticism such New Testament passages as Luke x. 18; John xii. 31 seq.; Rev. xii. 9, which represent Satan's right to appear before God in the ranks of celestial beings as continuing until the time of Christ and His redemptive work, and thus show the identity of the character of Satan in our book with that of the New Testament revelation, and in general the essential unity and consistency of the *entire* Satanology of the Holy Scriptures. Comp. what Schlottmann observes (p. 9 of his Commen., more particularly against Ewald) in favor of this identity of the Satan of the Prologue to our book with the same as presented in the remaining books of the Bible: "Even the later Hebrew representation of the world of evil spirits is much further removed from all dualism than Ewald's description of it would imply. In all the Hebrew conceptions of the subject the evil spirits never appear otherwise than as originally pure, but fallen through their own sin. They never have the power to accomplish more than the universal plan of the Almighty God permits to them. But this same thought the Prologue expresses in bold, poetic fashion when it relates that Satan, in order to tempt Job, must first obtain permission thereto from God Himself. In this the poet certainly does not intend in the least to lessen the gulf fixed between good and evil; rather is that striking contrast which is presented in the appearance of the unholy one as an inferior in the assembly of the holy altogether intentional, precisely as in the masterly conception of Giotto's celebrated picture. Moreover, that Satan here appears not at the head of his hosts, but alone, is a peculiarity that is required by the simplicity of plan in the poem; any other representation would be a superfluous detail of ornamentation. And how would the symbolic significance of that scene, great in its simplicity as it stands, be completely distorted and obscured, if Satan should, according to Ewald's supposition, enter the assembly of the holy ones with all his adherents," *etc.* Even Goethe, who, according to his own published confession, used the Satan of our book as the original of one of his most powerful spirit-creations, of Mephistopheles in Faust (see his remarks on the subject in Burkhardt's Conversations of Goethe with the Chancellor v. Müller, Stuttgart, 1871, p. 96: "A great work is produced only by the appropriation of foreign treasures. Have I not in Mephistopheles appropriated Job and a song of Shakespeare?")—even Goethe was evidently far removed from the disposition to pervert or to obscure the truly and decidedly diabolical character of this "spirit which always denies," great as is the difference between the modern creation of his muse, and the tempter of this venerable poem in the volume of revelation.

4. Finally, as regards the arguments *derived from the history of religion or revelation*, by which it is sought to prove that the Satan of our book is a Scriptural and theological anachronism, they resolve themselves as to their substance into arbitrary assumptions. *The Satanology of Job exhibits precisely that conception of the character which we are justified in expecting in view of the probability that it was composed between the patriarchal age and that of the exile.* The fact that the *name* Satan, *i. e.*, the "Adversary," the "Accuser," already attaches to the Evil One as a proper name (or at all events as an appellative used absolutely, comp. above, No. 1), exhibits, it is true, a certain progress, as compared with the documents of the Mosaic age, seeing that in them his dark personality is either symbolically veiled, as by the serpent in Gen. iii., or mysteriously kept out of sight, as by the mystical name Azazel, Lev. xvi. But this progress is by no means of such a sort as to require for its explanation the assumption of transforming influences of a religious-historical character from without, proceeding from the East, from Babylonia, or Persia; the name שָׂטָן being most assuredly all the time a genuine Hebrew name, mocking at every attempt to derive it from non-Israelitish heathen names of divinities! For, as has been already remarked above, nothing that is essential to the complete Satanic nature is wanting in that evil spirit-nature which lies concealed in the serpent of Paradise; as a crawling, crafty, smooth-tongued *tempter* of men, he is already preparing the way to become their *accuser*. And if it be said that the documents which stand nearest to the patriarchal and Mosaic ages make comparatively little mention of him, if on any given occasion they introduce

him neither as tempter nor as accuser, if *e. g.* in the fearful temptation which assailed Abraham when he was commanded to offer his son Isaac (Gen. xxii.), they leave his agency entirely out of the account, the simple explanation of all this is that the recognition of the mysterious co-operation of this evil spiritual agency with God's activity as ruler of the world *was effected only very gradually among the people of God.* It was a part of the redemptive *plan* of God so to lead and to educate them that at first everything, even temptations and severe moral trials, was to be referred to His own action and disposition, and only afterwards were they accustomed to discriminate between the agency of angels and demons in such cases and that of God. Comp. Delitzsch and Schlottmann in l. c.; also L. Schulze in the *Allg. liter. Anz.*, 1870. Oct., p 270. who reduces to its exact value Dillmann's assertion that the conception of Satan in our book is one that is only in process of development, and assigns to it the proper limitations.

On the question, why no further mention is made of Satan in the remainder of the poem, and especially in the Epilogue, Schlottmann expresses himself in the following striking language in l. c.: "How the power granted to the Evil One is everywhere made subservient to the Divine plan that is set forth in the clearest light by the issue of the poem; not only does Satan fail of his own end, but the temptations which he brings on the pious hero are made instrumental in raising him to a higher stage of knowledge and union with God. But that no mention at all is made in the Epilogue of the confusion brought on Satan is occasioned by the high simplicity of the poem, which everywhere confines itself to that which is most essential, and would fain leave the reader to divine everything which can be divined. Any scene at the end of the book, in which Satan should again make his appearance, no matter how the same might be described, would be insipid, unworthy, and fatal to the quiet grandeur of the conclusion."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The element of Satanology in the above section, which doctrinally considered is the most attractive, cannot of course have too much prominence given to it by the practical expositor. For him the principal figure in the Introduction of the poem is *Job himself*, the pious man who was at first abundantly endowed with earthly comforts, but who was afterwards plunged at once by a mysterious Divine decree ordaining his trial into a real abyss of temporal misery; who, however, bore this trial with unshaken patience and constancy, without allowing himself, for a time at least, to indulge in the slightest outbreak of complaining despondency, or passionate murmuring. This accordingly must be the theme of the practical and homiletic annotator on these introductory chapters of the book: *Job, the Old Testament saint, an example of that perfect patience in suffering, which is and remains also for the child of God under the New Dispensation one of the highest and most needful virtues* (comp. Jas. v. 11); or in other words: *Job, the Old Testament Ideal of a suffering righteous man, as a type of Christ, the Righteous Man in the highest and purest sense of the word, who by His innocent suffering is become the founder of the New Covenant.* In so far as any intimation is conveyed of a want of similarity between the conduct in suffering of the Old Testament type on the one side, and that of Christ and of true Christians (comp. 1 Pet. iv. 12 seq.) on the other, the closing verses of the Prologue (ch. ii. 11-13) may be included in the text, where the impending outbreak of the unregenerate and imperfect element in the nature of the Old Testament saints, is suggested and anticipated. We may thus point out how the sufferer, after victoriously overcoming so many preceding temptations, nevertheless succumbed to that last trial which visited him in the mute yet eloquent conduct of his friends, now become the accusers and suspecters of his innocence, when they sat down beside him. Or, in other words, it may be shown how the suffering saint, before the coming of Christ, *could resist indeed all other temptations, but was stranded at last on the rock of self-righteousness and of the diseased pride of virtue*—in contrast with which the conduct beseeming the *Christian* sufferer (the true πάσχειν ὡς Χριστιανός, 1 Peter iv. 16) is at once suggested. If however we decide to dwell more thoroughly and exclusively on the conduct of the type, we shall then omit from our text these closing verses, which are besides in close connection with ch. iii., and which form as it were the immediate basis of the gloomy picture there presented, and we shall treat simply of Job's steadfast endurance in the fire of sore tribulations which came upon him. In the latter case again we can either combine into one whole the two stages of the trial, the first—the lighter, consisting of the loss of his property and family, and the other—the more severe, consisting of the infliction on him of the most frightful of all bodily plagues; or we can consider the subject under two divisions, the point of separation being ch. i. 22. The attempt of Delitzsch to establish *seven* temptations as befalling Job in succession (the first four in ch. i. 13-18; the fifth in ch. ii. 7, 8; the sixth in ch. ii. 9, 10; and the seventh in ch. ii. 11-13), could be applied of course only in case we include those closing verses, narrating the mute visit of the friends. Much, however, may be urged against this division; as, *e. g.*, that no regular gradation can be observed in the seven trials thus distinguished; that the first four (ch. i. 13-18) constitute one connected trial, rather than four distinct trials, *etc.* On this account we must perhaps waive any homiletic use of this division, especially seeing that it might easily suggest a sensible contradiction to ch. v. 1-9: "in the seventh [trouble] no evil shall befall thee."

Particular Passages.—Ch. i. 1-5. COCCEIUS (ver. 5): Scripture selects this example of pious solicitude, in order to show that this holy man exercised the greatest solicitude at a time when we are wont to exercise it the least. For during our festivities what is it about which we mostly occupy our mind and conversation, but vanities? It is showing too much sourness, we think, to speak at our cups about the Kingdom of God, or His fear, or the hope of eternal life.

. . . . Finally, the constancy of this custom of Job's is to be noted. He was never free from care. However well instructed and obedient his children might be, he by no means laid aside his solicitude in their behalf. It is easy, when we think that we stand, to stumble and fall. There always remains in men a proneness to sin, however much they cultivate piety.—STARKE: Job gives to all parents an example: (1) That they should keep a watchful eye on their children's conduct and life. (2) That they should pray God to give their children salvation and blessing, without allowing themselves, however, to be prompted by their errors and transgressions to curse them, or to wish them evil. (3) That they must also pray in behalf of their children that God would be gracious to them and forgive their sins.

Ch. i. 6-12. BRENTIUS: Every temptation proceeds both from the Lord and from Satan. The latter seeks to destroy and to betray, the former to try man, and to teach His will. Hence faith, as it receives the good from the Lord's hand, so also it receives suffering. For he who receives the cross out of Satan's hand, receives it for his destruction (comp. 2 Cor. vii. 10); but he who receives it from the Lord's hand, receives it for his trial (comp. Heb. xii.)—STARKE: God, in accordance with His hidden counsel, permissively decrees at times much misery even to the most pious. This truth has always been a great stumbling-block to the reason. . . . It is to be observed, however: (*a*) That these sore trials were not occasioned in the first instance by Satan's calumnies against Job, but that even before the foundation of the world God had decreed and purposed to put all His saints to the test, each one in his measure. (*b*) That God inwardly sustained and strengthened Job so much with His consolation that his afflictions were as easily supported by him as the slight suffering of another. (*c*) That it was God's will that Job's patience should be made known to others for their blessed edification and imitation. (*d*) That God caused the friends' lack of knowledge to be instrumental in putting them to shame, and in leading them to be better instructed in the mystery of the cross. (*e*) That to Job himself also the exercise and trial of his faith was in the highest degree advantageous and necessary. (*f*) That the final issue decreed for these sufferings was not only one that could be borne, but also one to be desired, and in the highest degree delightful and honorable for Job. —SEB. SCHMIDT (on ver. 12); From this verse we learn clearly that the power of the Devil is indeed great, so that, when the Divine protection is withdrawn, men are in his hand; that it is nevertheless finite, and in ways without number weaker than the Divine; and hence that he can do nothing whatsoever unless the Lord should permit it to him, just as here he could not destroy even a single sheep of Job's before he had received permission.—VICT. ANDREA: This much is certain, that this scene in heaven may teach us that the destinies of men on earth have their ulterior roots and determining causes in the heavenly world; and that Satan, who is here represented as taking an active part in human affairs, notwithstanding all his hostility, can touch us only just so far as the Almighty God in His wisdom and love permits him.

Ch. i. 13-18. ZEYSS (in STARKE): Afflictions seldom come singly, but each joins hand with the other, and before one has passed away, another is already at the door, Ps. lxii. 8. Thus the Christian state is altogether a state of affliction, for which the best of all provisions is an iron front and a strong *paternoster*, *i. e.*, an intrepid faith and earnest prayer.

Ch. i. 19-22. BRENTIUS: Thou wilt endure without great sorrow the loss of all thy possessions, if only the Lord, the treasury of all good things, remains. Set aside the Lord, there being only the cross placed before thee, and thou shalt see what blasphemies will arise in a man's heart.—OSIANDER: In adversity we should look not at the means and instruments by which God sends calamity upon us, but to God only, from whom comes both good and evil, prosperity and adversity (Ruth i. 13; Sir. ii. 14).

Ch. ii. 1-8. ZEYSS: God sometimes permits Satan to have power over the pious, to torment them, either in the body, by this or that painful casualty, or in the soul, by tempting them, in order that their faith, their patience, humility, devotion, prayerfulness, *etc.*, may be tested, and the good which God has imparted to them, may be made manifest (Tob. xii. 13).—JOACH. LANGE: If any man is a brother of Job, although it be only in the sense that he endures a severe and long-continued sickness, produced, not by any special agency of Satan, but by natural causes —let him nevertheless be comforted, seeing that he may be assured that such a decree of God is by no means a token of Divine displeasure—provided only that the sufferer maintains his integrity, that after the example of Job his mind is upright with God, and he adheres loyally to Him.—J. H. JACOBI: Job, vindicating his virtue, justifying his Maker's eulogy of him, sits down on his heap of ashes as the glory and boast of God. God and His whole heavenly host look to see how he will bear his calamity. "He triumphs, and his triumph reaches higher than the stars."

Ch. ii. 9-13. BRENTIUS (on vers. 9, 10): You see here how great an evil is a wicked wife! For a wife is given by the Lord to share in bearing life's labors, and, as Scripture says, for a help-meet. But lo! Job's wife becomes a stumbling-block, and a blaspheming instrument of Satan; and thus she is a preacher of the irreligious flesh, teaching him in his afflictions to esteem God as dead, or as negligent of human affairs, and distrusting Divine succor, to rely on his own powers, and industry, and endeavors. —WOHLFARTH: A true friend in need (Sir. xl. 23; Rom. xii. 15), what a priceless treasure! As when all turned away from Job, and even his wife forsook him, three noble friends drew nigh to comfort him; thus it is that true friendship at all times asserts itself.—STARKE: Even in ministering comfort we must use discretion, in order that the wound which has been inflicted may not be torn open again. . . Job, who was so poorly comforted by his friends, is a type of Christ, who in His sufferings was also deprived of all consolation.

FIRST CHIEF DIVISION OF THE POEM.

THE ENTANGLEMENT—OR THE CONTROVERSIAL DISCOURSES OF JOB AND HIS FRIENDS.

CHAPTERS III—XXVIII.

The Outbreak of Job's Despair as the Theme and Immediate Occasion of the Colloquy.

CHAP. III.

a. Job curses his existence.

CHAP. III. 1–10.

1, 2 After this opened Job his mouth, and cursed his day. And Job spake,
and said,

3 Let the day perish wherein I was born,
and the night in which it was said, There is a man-child conceived!
4 Let that day be darkness;
let not God regard it from above,
neither let the light shine upon it!
5 Let darkness and the shadow of death stain it;
let a cloud dwell upon it;
let the blackness of the day terrify it!

6 As for that night, let darkness seize upon it;
let it not be joined unto the days of the year,
let it not come into the number of the months!
7 Lo, let that night be solitary;
let no joyful voice come therein!
8 Let them curse it that curse the day,
who are ready to raise up their mourning!
9 Let the stars of the twilight thereof be dark;
let it look for light but have none;
neither let it see the dawning of the day;
10 —because it shut not up the doors of my mother's womb,
nor hid sorrow from mine eyes.

b. He wishes that he were in the realm of the dead rather than in this life.

VERS. 11–19.

11 Why died I not from the womb?
why did I not give up the ghost when I came out of the belly?
12 Why did the knees prevent me?
or why the breasts that I should suck?
13 For now should I have lain still, and been quiet;
I should have slept, then had I been at rest,

14 With kings and counsellors of the earth,
which built desolate places for themselves;

15 or with princes that had gold,
who filled their houses with silver:
16 or as a hidden untimely birth I had not been.
as infants which never saw light.

17 There the wicked cease from troubling,
and there the weary be at rest.
18 There the prisoners rest together;
they hear not the voice of the oppressor.
19 The small and great are there;
and the servant is free from his master.

c. He asks why he, being weary of life, must still live.

VERS. 20–26.

20 Wherefore is light given to him that is in misery,
and life unto the bitter in soul;
21 which long for death, but it cometh not;
and dig for it more than for hid treasures;
22 which rejoice exceedingly,
and are glad, when they can find the grave?

23 Why is light given to a man whose way is hid,
and whom God hath hedged in?
24 For my sighing cometh before I eat,
and my roarings are poured out like the waters.
25 For the thing which I greatly feared is come upon me,
and that which I was afraid of is come unto me.
26 I was not in safety, neither had I rest, neither was I quiet;
yet trouble came!

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. *The caption or prose introduction of Job's outgushing lamentation.* Vers. 1–2.

Ver. 1. **After this opened Job his mouth and cursed his day.** [אַחֲרֵי־כֵן: after the appearance of the friends, their seven days' silence, and after their conduct had wrought its full effect on the mind of Job.—E. "Opened his mouth; פָּתַח in conformity to the sensuous and poetic nature of Hebrew speech and thought, which uses the physical action to represent the mental." DAV.]. "His day," viz.: his birthday—the day on which he had come into the world. Comp. ch. i. 4.

Ver. 2. **And Job began and spake.**—The verse consists only of these three words: וַיַּעַן אִיּוֹב וַיֹּאמַר. The literal meaning of וַיַּעַן is, "and he answered;" for עָנָה is, in general, to begin to speak when incited to it, whether the antecedent occasion consist of words or of actions; precisely the same as the New Testament ἀποκρίνεσθαι. [See Conant's note *in loco*, proving that "in most of the cases quoted in support of the signification *to speak up, to begin speaking* (Ges. Lex. 2, and others), the reference to something prior, as the *occasion* of speaking, is clear, and in all of them there is ground for the writer's choice of this form of expression."] Here accordingly it is the persistent and expressive silence of the friends to which Job replies, not to any question, nor to any uttered remark of theirs.—וַיֹּאמַר, with Pattach in the final syllable, although the word is Milel, is found only in the prose captions of the discourses in our book; here, however, in every case: comp. ch. iv. 1; vi. 1; viii. 1, *etc.*—After these brief words of introduction, begins the poetic part of the book, distinguished by the poetic accentuation of the Masoretes. Comp. Introd. § 3. "From this point on the epic calmness with which the hero has suffered, and the poet told his story, yields to the pathos of the drama." DILLMANN. The contents of this first tragic, high-soaring, poetic discourse of Job are expressly given in the caption in ver. 1 as being *the cursing of the day of his own birth*, an ardently expressed *longing for death.* Comp. Jeremiah's abbreviated imitation in chap. xx. 14-18. ["There is a passage of Jeremiah so exactly similar that it might almost be imagined a direct imitation: the meaning is the same, nor is there any very great difference in the phraseology; but Jeremiah fills up the ellipses, smooths and harmonizes the rough and uncouth language of Job, and dilates a short distich into two equal distichs, consisting of somewhat longer verses. . . . The imprecation of Jeremiah has more in it of complaint than of indignation; it is milder, softer, and more plaintive, peculiarly calculated to excite pity, in moving which the great excellence of this prophet consists: while that of Job is more adapted to strike us with terror than to excite our compassion." LOWTH. And to the same

effect Michaelis: *Jobi est tragica illa et regia tristitia, dicam, an desperatio: Jeremiæ flebiles elegi, misericordiam provocantes, nec lacrimis major luctus.*"] In respect of form, this mournful lamentation, which contains the theme and starting point of the following discussions, falls into three strophes of about equal length; vers. 3-10; vers. 11-19; and vers. 20-26, of which the last alone gives evidence of a slight abridgement at the end, and that no doubt intentional, as the short, blunt breaking off of the second member of ver. 26, which consists of only two words, וַיָּבֹא רגז, gives us to understand. That, with the majority of modern expositors, we are to adopt this three-fold division of the strophes, and not, with Stickel and Delitzsch, a greater number of divisions, longer or shorter, is made certain by the לָמָּה, which recurs at the beginning of the 2d and 3d strophes (comp. Introd. *l. c.*).

2. *First Long Strophe:* Job curses his existence; vers 3-10.—*First strophe:* vers. 3-5.

Ver. 3. **Perish the day wherein I was born.**—יֹאבַד, with Pattahh in the last syllable, the accent having been retracted on account of the tone-syllable following (Ewald, § 139, *b*).—The elliptical relative clause, אִוָּלֶד בּוֹ, as also the like clause (אָמַר) in the following member, are to be explained by the excited, rapid movement of the poetic style. The Imperf. [alias Fut.], (instead of which the parallel passage in Jeremiah xx. 14 exhibits the Perf. [Præt.] יֻלַּדְתִּי), is the Imperf. of the Past, as is אָמוּת, ver. 11. Comp. Ewald, § 136, *b* [who calls it the *præsens præteriti*, אִוָּלֵד=*nascendus eram:* and see Green, Gr. § 263, 5: "the speaker, by a bold figure, places himself before his birth, and prays that the day which was to give him existence might be annihilated, so that he might be saved from the misery of living."]—**And the night which said: A man-child is conceived.**—The night of Job's conception is poetically personified, as a living being, endowed with the gift of speech (comp. Ps. xix. 3). It weakens the expression, and furthermore is by no means required by the masc. אמר (for לַיְלָה is masc.), to supply כַּאֲשֶׁר before אָמַר, "the night in which it was said" (Pesh., Vulg. [E. V.], *etc.*). In the deep excitement of feeling which now possesses him, all the objects of his thought become living powers, concrete, plastic forms. This is the case here with the night of his conception. For this is the night which is meant—not that of his birth, as the invariable usage of the verb הרה, "to be conceived," shows. Had the second member been intended to be synonymous in thought and expression with the first, חולל would have been used, the usual synonym elsewhere in poetry of נולד. It is not only the language, however, which may be urged in favor of the literal construction of הֹרָה, but the general style of the discourse, which is characterized by poetic vividness and restless alternation. To this add that in what follows each of these two epochs of the life is made the object of a separate and vehement curse; to wit, first, in vers. 4, 5, the day of birth, and then, in vers. 6-10, the night of conception. For this sharp and obviously intentional distinction between these two initial points of the life, comp. Ps. li. 7. [גָּבֶר, "not a man-child, Eng. Ver., but a man, the name proper to the mature state being applied by anticipation to the infant or embryo. The emphasis is not upon the sex, implying greater joy at the birth of a son than a daughter; Job says, 'a man,' because he is speaking of himself." GREEN. HEB. CHREST.]

Vers. 4, 5. A special curse of the day of birth: an expansion of ver. 3 *a*.

Ver. 4. **That day—let it be darkness.**—Let it be a *dies ater s. infaustus.* Whether the thought particularly intended is, that at each annual return of the birth-day darkness, that is to say, stormy weather, should prevail instead of bright and clear weather (Hirz., Dillmann), may well be doubted in view of the indefinite brevity of the language. Moreover such a meteorological interpretation would have something trivial about it.—**Let not God from above ask after it:** *i. e.* let not God, who is throned on high above (chap. xxxi. 2, 28), interest himself in it from thence (comp. דרש in Deut. xi. 12), let him not bring it forth out of its dark hiding-place. ["Let it pass away as a thing lost and unsought." CON.] **And let not light shine forth upon it.**—נְהָרָה, "radiance of light, brightness of day," found only here; one of the many feminine forms of nouns peculiar to our book, such as עֲנָנָה, ver. 5; כִּסְלָה, chap. iv. 6; תָּהֳלָה, chap. iv. 18; דִּבְרָה, chap. v. 8 (Hirz.).

Ver. 5. **Let darkness and death-shade reclaim it.**—גָּאַל, to redeem, reclaim, to make good one's right to (not=גָּעַל, to defile, Targ.), ["stain" E. V. The expression seems to refer back to Gen. i. 2, which mentions the primeval darkness, out of which by the Divine Fiat the light, together with its product, the day, was evolved. That Darkness was thus the origiual proprietor of the days, and is here called on to reclaim Job's birth-day. E. "The idea being that that day was a stray portion of the kingdom of death in the midst of light, and to be reclaimed again by death." DAV.] The conceptions "darkness and death-shade" form a sort of hendiadys, signifying "the thickest darkness, the deepest death-gloom:" comp. chap. x. 21; xxxiv. 22, *etc.;* also Luke i. 79 (צלמות is, with Ew. § 270 *c*, and with Dillm., to be read צַלְמוּת, and defined "black darkness"). **Let clouds encamp above it:** continually to bide it [עֲנָנָה, collective: תשכן, to pitch one's tent; fig. for settling or spreading]. Comp. יוֹם עָנָן וַעֲרָפֶל, Joel ii. 2.—**Let the obscuration of the day terrify it:** or literally "the obscurations of the day" [*i. e.* all that makes a day dark and dismal. E.]. Instead of the כִּמְרִירֵי of the Masora (to which reading Ges., Schlott., Hahn, adhere:

["the *Chireq* is an attenuated *Pattach* from the lessening of the tone in the construct state:" CON.]), we are to read כִּמְרִירֵי י׳, and take the sing. of this construct plural as a synonym of חַכְלִיל ("duskiness"), a noun of the same formal structure (comp. also שַׁפְרִיר, "tapestry," and other similar words of like structure in Ewald, § 157, *a*): ["with the third radical repeated, as is customary in words descriptive of color." DILLMANN]. The "darkening," blackening of the day (כִּמְרִיר from the root כמר, "to be burnt, blackened") is a result produced in a specially marked and striking manner by the eclipse of the sun; for which reason we are here to associate solar eclipses with the dark mass of clouds, thus intensifying the effect (Olsh., Dillm., Del., *etc.*). If we adhere to the Masoretic reading we should have to follow Aquila, the Targum, the Vulgate, in translating: *terreant eum quasi amaritudines diei* [Marg. of E. V.: "let them terrify it, as those who have a bitter day." Hengst.: "May whatever is bitter to a day terrify it:" according to his explanation, Job would have retribution overtake that day; and as he himself had been filled with bitternesses, he would have the day from which all his sufferings took their origin, be afflicted with whatever might be bitter to it. E.]. But this instead of a strengthening, would be a weakening of the thought. Umbreit's explanation: "let it be terrified as by incantations (comp. Arab. marîr, *incantamentum*), which darken the day," anticipates that which is not expressed until further on, in ver. 8, and is furthermore chargeable with being excessively artificial. [With Umbreit's may be classified the rendering of Merx, who, reading כֹּמְרֵי יוֹם, translates: "May the priests of day frighten it away!" There can be little doubt that the rendering "darkenings of the day" is the one best suited to the context, and this whether with Ges., Con., *etc.*, we retain the Masoretic Chiriq, or with Ewald, Zöckler, *etc.*, change it to Pattach.—E.]

Second Strophe: vers. 6-10. A special curse of the night of conception: an expansion of ver. 3 *b*. The reason why this expansion is twice as long as that of ver. 3 *a*, is found by Hirzel and Dillmann to lie in the fact that it was in particular the night of his conception which gave Job his existence (see ver. 10). ["Twice as many verses, for it was twice as guilty, and the crime of his existence lay chiefly with it." DAV.] This, however, would be attributing to the author altogether too much premeditation and systematic deliberation.

Ver. 6. **That night—let thick darkness take it**; *i. e.* let everlasting darkness seize on it and hold it fast as its possession, so that it can never come forth into the light of day. ["אֹפֶל, an intenser gloom than חֹשֶׁךְ, deepest primitive darkness, chaos and 'old night.'" DAV.] Let it not rejoice among the days of the year.—אַל יִחַדְּ (for אַל יִחַדְּ, with an auxiliary Pattach [furtive]; comp. Ewald, § 224, *c*. [Green, § 109, 2], from חָדָה, *gaudere* (Ex. xviii. 9), is evidently equivalent to: "let it not be glad of its existence among the days of the year." ["The night is not considered so much to rejoice on account of its own beauty—*fingitur pulchra nox de se ipsa gandere*, Ges.—as to form one of the joyous and triumphant choral troop of nights, that come in harmonious and glittering procession." DAV.] More insipid is the sense given by the reading followed by the Targum and Symmachus: אַל יֵחַד, "let it not be joined to the days of the year, let it not be enrolled among them," Comp. Ges. xlix. 6. [So E. V., Ren., Merx]. ["Of course not natural days, as in vers. 3, 4, but civil days, embracing the entire diurnal period, in which sense they include the night." GREEN. CHREST.] **Let it not come into the number of the months:** *i. e.* let it not be numbered among the days, the sum of which constitutes the twelve months of the year (LXX. correctly: μηδὲ ἀριθμηθείη εἰς ἡμέρας μηνῶν). Comp. Wieseler, *Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien und der evangel. Geschichte*, Gotha, 1869, p. 291; which correctly finds here a reference to the fact that the ancient Hebrews reckoned according to the lunar year; *i. e.* by years of 354 days (consisting of twelve months, alternating in length between 30 and 29 days, and equalized with the solar year by an intercalary month of 30 days about every three years).

Ver. 7. **Ha, that night!—let it be barren.** גַּלְמוּד, lit. "stony hard," here and also in Isaiah xlix. 21 (where it is used of [Zion, personified as] a woman), the same as "barren." ["Sitting in the everlasting darkness, that Night remains barren. It utters no shout of joy over the children born to it." SCHLOTT. This sense is in better harmony with the etymology, and the vivid personification of the passage, as well as Job's vindictive feeling over the fact that that night had conceived him, than the "solitary" of the Eng. Ver. (Vulg. "desolate," Syr.—E.] **Let no shout of joy come therein.**—רְנָנָה, not "a song of the spheres" (Fries), [a conception and expression foreign to the Heb.: see the opposite thought expressed Ps. xix. 3.—E.]; but a jubilant shout of joy over the birth (or conception) of a man.

Ver. 8 **Let them curse it who curse days, they who are skilled to rouse up the dragon [leviathan].** ["He wishes everything dire and dreadful to be heaped upon it, or employed against it, not only all real evils, but even such as are imaginary and fictitious. He therefore invokes the aid of sorcerers, *who curse the day*, who claim the power of inflicting curses on it." GREEN, CHREST.] אֹרְרֵי־יוֹם, "cursers of the day," *i. e.* sorcerers, who, according to the superstition of the old oriental world, knew how by their ban to make *dies infausti*, and who, therefore, had the power so to bewitch any particular day as to make it a day of misfortune. This art of sorcery, the actual existence of which the poetic style of the discourse concedes and assumes without going further, is characterized still more particularly, and with vivid gradation in the language, by the following clause:

"they who are skilled (capable, empowered) to rouse up (עֹרֵר in poetry for לְעֹרֵר, comp. Ewald § 285, *c*) leviathan," *i. e.* the great dragon, who is the enemy of the sun and the moon, and seeks accordingly by swallowing them up to create darkness. That there is here an allusion to this well-known superstition in respect to solar and lunar eclipses, which is found among several other nationalities, *e. g.* the ancient inhabitants of India (see Bohlen, *Das alte Indien*, I. 290), the Chinese (Käuffer, *Das chines. Volk*, p. 123), the North-African natives of Algeria (comp. Delitzsch i. 79) appears: (1) From the connection, which forbids our taking לִוְיָתָן either as in chap. xl. 25 seq.; Ps. civ. 26, in its usual sense, of the crocodile, or again of terrestrial serpents (dragons), and so, with Umbreit and others, to think of snake-charmers or crocodile-tamers. (2) From the parallel passage in chap. xxvi. 13, where the mention of "the fleeing serpent" points to the same astronomical superstition. (3) From Isaiah xxvii. 1, where the collocation of the words לִוְיָתָן נָחָשׁ בָּרִחַ designate the same mythical being (the dragon *râhu* or *kêtu* of the Hindûs). The poet accordingly in the passage before us gives to the curse that is to be pronounced on the day this highly poetic turn, by wishing that the sorcerers might secure the consummation of the curse by instigating the celestial dragon against the sun and moon, thus producing an eclipse of those bodies. To identify that dragon here (and in chap. xxvi. 13) with a constellation, by a reference to the dragon whose convolutions lie between the Great and Little Bear, or to any other serpent-figure among the stars (Hirz., Hahn, Schlott., *etc.*), does not harmonize well with the unmistakable meaning of עֹרֵר, "to excite, rouse up." [The explanation of Umbreit, Rosenm., Noy., Bar., *etc.*, a little more fully stated, is that "the verse probably refers to a class of persons who were supposed to have the power of making any day fortunate or unfortunate, to control future events, and even to call forth the most terrific monsters from impenetrable forests, or from the deep, for the gratification of their own malice, or that of others. Balaam, whom Balak sent for to curse Israel, affords evidence of the existence of a class of persons who were supposed to be capable of producing evil by their imprecations." Noyes. One objection to this view is stated above by Zöckler, that it is not favored by the connection. Another objection suggested by Dav. is that "it is somewhat flat. The second member, instead of rising in significance, seems to fall, for to *curse the day* appears a much profounder exercise of power, reaching much further, and laying a spell much deeper, even on the hidden principles of nature and time, than any mere charming of an animal, however terrible." According to the Fathers (whom Lee and Words. follow), Leviathan here is typical of Satan, "the great spiritual Leviathan." When it is remembered that the same writers find the same typical significance in the description of "leviathan" in chap. xli., the extravagance of the fancy will at once appear. Davidson objects that "it cannot be shown that the superstition [above referred to] was current in Semitic lands; it belongs to India." It is true, however, that among the Egyptians, with whose institutions the author of this book was well acquainted, eclipses were attributed to the victory of Typhon over the sun-god, that the crocodile (the leviathan of chap. xli.) was a representative of Typhon, and moreover that Egypt was celebrated above all lands for her sorcery. These three facts taken together would of themselves suffice to account for and to explain Job's language in the passage before us.—E.]

Ver. 9. **Let the stars of the twilight be dark**; the stars, namely, of its morning twilight, the precursors of approaching day-light, the meaning accordingly being: Let this night be followed by no genuine day's radiance. In favor of this sense of נֶשֶׁף, to wit, morning twilight, *crepusculum*, may be urged, apart from the two following members of the verse, the analogy of chap. vii. 4; Ps. cxix. 147, where נֶשֶׁף has the same signification, though elsewhere certainly it signifies the evening twilight (*diluculum*), as *e. g.* chap. xxiv. 15; Prov. vii. 9; 2 Kings vii. 5. **And let it not gaze upon the eye-lashes of the dawn.** Delitzsch: "let it not refresh itself with the eye-lashes of the dawn:" correctly as to the sense; for here, as always רָאָה בְ denotes beholding with the feeling of pleasure, enjoying the sight of anything. "The eye-lashes of the dawn" (the same expression is found in chap. xli. 10) are the first rays of the rising dawn, opening as it were its eyes: comp. χρυσέης ἡμέρας βλέφαρον, Soph. Antiq. 103. [To be noted is the full form of the fut. יִרְאֶה, instead of the apocopated.]

Ver. 10. The כִּי with which the verse begins refers back to the beginning of the period in ver. 6, and thus gives the ground of the violent curse just pronounced upon the night of his conception. **Because it shut not up the doors of my mother's womb**; *i. e.* did not make the same barren, did not prevent his conception: comp. Gen. xvi. 2; xx. 18; 1 Sam. i. 5. בִּטְנִי, a poetic ellipsis for בֶּטֶן אִמִּי. [Comp. chap. xix. 17, where the expression בְּנֵי בִטְנִי, acc. to Ges., means brethren born out of the same mother's womb. See, however, on the passage. "Juvenal has used the same liberty of expression, Sat. vi. i. 124: Ostenditque tuum, generose Britannice, ventrem." Con.]—**And so hide sorrow from my eyes.** The force of the negation extends out of the first over this, the second member of the verse, as is the case also in ver. 11. Comp. Gesen. § 152 [§ 149], 3. [The influence of the negative extended here by means of Vav consecutive. See Ewald § 351 *a.*] The indefinite, and, so to speak, absolute term, עָמָל, denotes some great and fearful affliction which Job was even then suffering.

3. *Second Long Strophe:* Job utters his choice to be in the realm of the dead rather than in this life, vers. 11–19. The strophe embraces three sub-divisions, or strophes, of equal length, each consisting of three verses.

a. Vers. 11–13. [The wish that he had died at birth.]

Ver. 11. **Why died I not from the womb?** *i. e.*, immediately after birth, immediately after I saw the light of this world.—So should מֵרֶחֶם be explained here, according to the parallelism of the second member of the verse, not according to Jerem. xx. 17, which passage speaks rather of dying in the womb (מִן being used there in the local, not the temporal sense), of dying, therefore, as an embryo, a thought which is foreign to our author. (So in opposition to Schlott. and Del.) [The view of Junius, as given by Schlott., of the gradation of thought in this verse and the following, is at least striking enough to be stated here. It represents Job as here cursing his life in four stages of its development: in the womb, immediately after birth, when taken up by the father, and finally when put to the mother's breast. It may be doubted nevertheless whether Job's impassioned outburst is characterized by such careful and minute discrimination. The future אָמוּת, like אוּלַד in ver. 3, is an example of the poet's bold idealization, which, taking its position back of the moment of birth, asks, 'Why may I not die from the womb?' See Green, § 263, 5; Ew. § 136, 6.—E.] **Come forth out of the womb and expire?**—Expire, to wit, immediately after coming forth. On the extension of the negation over the second member, comp. notes on ver. 10. [The Fut. (or Imperf.) אֶגְוָע expressing that which is subsequent to the Pret. (Perf.) יָצָאתִי.]

Ver. 12. **Why did knees anticipate me?** [Con.: Why were the knees ready for me?—"Prevent," in A. V., in the obsolete sense, to come before, and so to anticipate]: *i. e.*, the knees or lap of the father, joyfully saluting the newly-born child. Comp. Gen. l. 23; Is. lxvi. 12. It is less natural to understand the knees of a woman to be meant, to wit, the knees of an attendant midwife or nurse. Comp. Gen. xxx. 3. ["The longing and anxious desire of the yearning mother to nurse her unborn darling has never been so happily expressed elsewhere." Good.] There is certainly nothing in the passage which points to any custom of heathen antiquity, involving the formal recognition of the child by the father, as Hirzel supposes. [At all events, as Dillm. observes, such a recognition is not the leading thought of the passage.—E.] **And what (=why) the breasts that I should suck?**—["There is a certain impatience and disgust in the מָה: Why, what were the breasts that I should suck?" Dav. The dual forms of the original, "two knees," "two breasts," are preserved in the translation by Dav. and Renan, perhaps with needless literality.] כִּי consecutive, as in chs. vi. 11; vii. 12; x. 6—and often. The Imperf. (Fut.) אִינָק describing an action immediately following after that which is previously mentioned, like אֶגְוָע, ver. 11; אֶשְׁקוֹט and יָנוּחַ, ver. 13, *etc.*

Ver. 13. **For now I should have lain down and been quiet.** A reason for the wish contained in the questions of vers. 10 and 12; therefore כִּי here="for," not "surely" (Del.)—עַתָּה, like אָז elsewhere, "then, by this time." Comp. ch. xiii. 19; 1 Sam. xiii. 13. **I should have slept** (lit.: "I should have fallen asleep;" and so also in the first member: "I should have laid myself down"), **then would there be rest for me,** *viz.*, the rest of the dead in the under-world, of the shades in Sheol, which, as compared with the inexpressible misery of this upper world, is evermore rest and repose. For the impersonal use of נוּחַ comp. Isa. xxiii. 12; Nehem. ix. 28.

b. Vers. 14–16. A more particular description of the rest in the realms of the dead, which Job longs for. Vers. 14 and 15 are still dependent on the verbs in ver. 13.

Ver. 14. **With kings and counsellors of the land.**—יֹעֲצֵי אָרֶץ, the counsellors of a land, *i. e.*, the highest officers of the state, royal advisers, not kings themselves. **Who built ruins for themselves.** — If the reading חֳרָבוֹת is correct, then the passage certainly speaks of the building of ruins (comp. the same word in Isa. lviii. 12; lxi. 4; Mal. i. 4). The expression, however, can scarcely mean the rebuilding of fallen structures, a thought which many of the ancient writers found in it, but which is obviously far-fetched and foreign to the context, especially if the rebuilding of ruined edifices is taken as of the same meaning with the expression, "to be rich, to be well endowed, *opibus abundare.*" Neither can it refer to the building of mausoleums, houses for the dead, or, in particular, pyramids; an interpretation defended by Hirzel, Ewald, Fürst, Delitzsch, Dillmann [Kamphausen, Wemyss, Bernard, Barnes, Wordsworth, Carey, Renan, Rodwell, Elzas, Merx], but not sufficiently verified etymologically. The Coptic *πι—χραμ* cannot, without further evidence, be identified with חרבות, even admitting that the interchange of ב and מ is not something unheard of. In any case it could not be proved that the author had in mind the *pyramids of Egypt*, so that the passage cannot be wrested to favor the theory of the Egyptian nationality of the poet; comp. Introd. § 7. The simplest and most obvious way of explaining it is, with Umbreit, Hahn, Schlottmann, Vaihinger, Heiligstedt [Gesenius, Noyes, Hengstenberg, Green in *Chrestom.*], to recognize in the חֳרָבוֹת an ironical designation of great, splendid palaces, which, notwithstanding their grandeur, must at last fall into ruin—a process which, in the East, as every where in hot countries, takes place with startling rapidity and suddenness. The expression is thus to be taken in a catachrestic sense, of that which is not yet indeed a ruin, but which will inevitably become such (comp. "dust," "ashes," "grass," "a worm," *etc.*, used to designate man: chap. x. 9; Ps. ciii. 14, 15; xc. 5, *etc.*). The difficulty of the expression has suggested several attempts to amend the text, as, *e. g.*, by Böttcher (*de inferis*, § 298), רְחֹבוֹת, "streets, courts;" by Olshausen, אַרְמְנוֹת, "palaces;" by J. D. Michaelis (*Suppl.* p. 905), חֲרָמוֹת, which, according to the Arabic, would be "temples, sanctuaries." Comp. also the LXX., which translates by ἐγαυριῶντο ἐπὶ ξίφεσιν,

the text of which would be הַגְּאוֹנִים בַּחֲרָבוֹת. [The expression as it stands in the text is certainly a difficult one, and unquestioning confidence in regard to the true interpretation is scarcely to be looked for. The rendering adopted by Zöckler, "who have built themselves ruins," is indeed, as he claims, the simplest and most obvious rendering of the words as they now read. But, on the other hand, it may be urged: (1) This proleptic ironical use of the word "ruins" in the connection would be an unlooked for and an artificial interruption of the pathetic flow of thought—of the ardent, plaintive yearning for death, or for the condition in which death would place him. (2) The kind of irony which would thus be expressed is unsuited to the state of Job's feelings in this discourse. Irony there is in the passage doubtless, but it is the irony of personal feeling, suggested by the contrast between his present misery and destitution, and the rest and equality of the grave. The irony which would have led him to see ruins in the palaces of the great would have been altogether alien to the intense subjectivity of his mood. Job is here thinking of *himself*—of what *he* would have been—of the rest, and the equality with earth's greatest, which would have been *his*, had he died at his birth. To interject here a sudden satire on the destiny awaiting the external splendor of others would be untrue to nature, and so unworthy of the poet's art. (3) The anticipation of ruin seems scarcely in harmony with the particular object of the immediate context, which is to describe the greatness of kings and counsellors, as of men high in rank and rich in their possessions. As Davidson says of this interpretation, it is "a sense which does not magnify, but minishes, the reputation of the great dead." On the other hand, the interpretation "mausoleums" or "pyramids" *is* in harmony with the particular object of the context, enhancing the greatness of the persons spoken of, as well as with the general train of thought and feeling in this strophe, dwelling as it does on the condition and surroundings of the dead. It does not seem unreasonable, therefore, to conclude either that the word in its present form may be thus defined, or that the word in its original form being an unusual one, or of foreign origin, it was afterwards modified under the influence of the familiar Hebrew phrase, "to build ruins," בָּנָה חֳרָבוֹת.—E.]

Ver. 15. **Or with princes that had gold, who filled their houses with silver.**—If the חרבות of the preceding verse are not "pyramids," the בָּתִּים of this verse cannot possibly be understood to mean "houses of the dead," as Hirzel explains. But even if that construction of the former verse be the true one, it would still be in the highest degree unnatural, artificial, and forced, to understand the expression in the passage before us as meaning any thing else than the riches which princes during life heap up in their palaces. Comp. ch. xxii. 18.

Ver. 16. **Or like a hidden untimely birth I should not be.**—I should not exist, have no being. נֵפֶל, lit. a "falling away" (ἔκτρωμα), an abortion, as in Ps. lviii. 9; Eccles. vi. 3. For טָמַן in the sense of "to hide in the ground, to bury," comp. Gen. xxxv. 4; Ex. ii. 12. The second member more particularly describes the condition of these abortions, as of those who never saw the light ("the light of life;" comp. ch. xxxiii. 30). Furthermore, as to its contents, the entire verse, although varying in construction from the verse preceding, is by the אוֹ at the beginning made co-ordinate with it; and this immediate juxtaposition of the founders of great palaces [or pyramids], of rich millionaires, and —of still-born babes! produces a contrast most *bizarre* and startling in its effect. "All these are removed from the sufferings of this life in the quiet of their grave—be their grave a 'ruin' gazed upon by their descendants, or a hole dug out in the earth, and again filled in as it was before." DELITZSCH.

c. Vers. 17–19. Exhibiting more in detail the extent to which death equalizes the inequalities of men's lots in life.

Ver. 17. **There the wicked have ceased their raging.**—שָׁם, in the state of the dead, in the under-world ["conceived of after the analogy of sepulchral caves, and where the dead were deemed to preserve the same relations which they had held during their life." REN.]. רְשָׁעִים, the godless, the abandoned, who are ruled by evil passions and lusts, as in Isa. xlviii. 22; lvii. 21; Ps. i. 4, *etc.* Hence רֹגֶז is the stormy agitation, or *inward* raging of such men ["corresponds to the radical idea of looseness, broken in pieces, want of restraint, therefore of *Turba*, contained etymologically in רֶשַׁע."—DEL.]; comp. Isa. lvii. 20; Jer. vi. 7. Dillmann understands by the "raging of the wicked" the furious ravaging of insolent tyrants, with which is then vividly contrasted in the second member the enfeebled, powerless condition of those who are "exhausted of strength." But there is nothing in the connection to show that any such contrast was intended between tyrants and the oppressed, between persecutors and the persecuted; and even the mention of the "taskmaster" in ver. 18 has nothing in it to confirm this interpretation, which arbitrarily attributes to רְשָׁעִים the sense of עָרִיצִים. Comp. ch. xv. 20; xxvii. 13; Isa. xiii. 11; xxv. 3; Ps. xxxvii. 25, *etc.* [in most of which passages, however, it will be found that the parallelism sustains the notion of the equivalence of the two terms, and of the frequent use of the former in the sense assigned to it by Dillmann. Do we not hear in these words an echo of Job's own calamities? Were not the turbulent, restless, fierce Chaldeans and Sabeans fit types of the רְשָׁעִים with their רֹגֶז? and was not Job himself in his present helplessness one of the very יְגִיעֵי כֹחַ?—E.]

Ver. 18. **Together rest the prisoners.**—יַחַד, all together, so many as there are of them, as in chap. xxiv. 4. ["The *Pilel* שַׁאֲנַן signifies perfect freedom from care." DEL.]—**They hear not the taskmaster's voice,** *i. e.*, the voice of the overseer, or slave-driver, issuing his orders, urging to work, and threatening with blows. Comp. Gen. iii. 7; v. 6, 10; Zechariah ix. 8.

Ver. 19. **Small and great are there the same.**—הוּא שָׁם; not "are there, are found there" (LXX., Vulg., Hirz., Hahn, Schl. [Hengstenb., Ren., Good, Lee, Con., Dav., Rod.]), but "are there the same, equal in rank and worth." הוא here accordingly is emphatic=ὁ αὐτός, idem, as also in Isa. xli. 4; Ps. cii. 28. [So Umbr., Ew., Del., Wem., Elz. The thought is substantially the same, according to either view. According to the former, הוא refers with emphasis to each subject, individually, "he, each is there," *implying* equality of condition; according to the latter, הוא has more the quality of a predicate, *expressing* equality of condition. The former is preferable, as being simpler, more customary, and better suited to the *double subject*, "small" and "great." Elsewhere in the sense of *idem* it is used of a *single* subject. Comp. ref. above.—E.] Furthermore, the second member: "and free (is) the servant from his master," shows in a special manner that our verse is parallel in sense to the preceding; as there "prisoners" and "taskmasters" are contrasted, so here in the first member "small" and "great," in the second "servant" and "master." [Davidson, perhaps, finds too much in these words when he says (although the remark is a striking one): "It is this last that fascinates Job in the place of the dead—the slave is free from his master; and Job is the slave, and one whom he will not name is the master—Has not man a hard service on the earth, and as the days of a hireling are his days?" ch. vii. 1.]

4. *Third Long Strophe* (divided into two shorter strophes of three and four verses respectively): Job asks, why must he, who is weary of life, still live? vers. 20–26.

a. Vers. 20–22. [The question in a general form.]

Ver. 20. **Wherefore gives He light to the wretched one?**—The name of God, who is unmistakably the subject of the clause, is not expressly mentioned, from a motive of reverential awe; it is presupposed as a thing self-evident that he who gives light is God, and none other. Comp. ch. xxiv. 22. [The Eng. Ver. takes the verb impersonally: "Wherefore is light given, *etc.?*" And so Good, Lee, Wemyss, Ren., *etc.* Schlottmann and Green also prefer the impersonal construction on the ground that it is better suited to the present discourse and the state of feeling from which it proceeds, and that supplying 'God' as the subject "gives an uncalled-for appearance of open and conscious murmuring to these moanings of uncontrollable anguish." It is to be observed, however, that in verse 23 the hedging of man about is directly ascribed to God; and that although God is not formally challenged by name as yet, there is through the whole discourse an audible under-tone of suppressed defiance, which seems all the time on the point of expressing itself. At the same time, one cannot but feel that this Curse is a cry of anguish rather than a cry of defiance, and that the suppression of God's name in this connection is a most natural manifestation of Job's feelings in their present stage of development—although, as Hirzel has shown, it is quite in our author's manner thus to omit the name of God. See ch. viii. 18; xii. 13; xvi. 7; xx. 23; xxii. 21; xxv. 2; xxvii. 22; xxx. 19. "*Gives he*, a distant fling at God, though a certain reverence refuses to utter His name, but *He* is at the base of such awful entanglement and perverse attitude of things." (Dav.).—E.]

Parallel with לְעָמֵל, "to the wretched," stands in the second member, לְמָרֵי נָפֶשׁ, "to the troubled in soul," those whose heart is troubled [lit. "the bitter in soul," *i. e.*, those whose souls have known life's bitterness.—E.] The same expression is found in Prov. xxxi. 6; 1 Sam. i. 10; xxii. 2.

Vers. 21–22 contain specifications in participial form of the phrase מָרֵי נָפֶשׁ, with finite verbs attached in the second member of each verse, a construction which elsewhere also is not unfrequently met with (see Ew. § 350, *b*).

Ver. 21. **Who wait long for death—and it comes not** (lit. "and it is not," וְאֵינֶנּוּ, comp. verse 9), **and dig for it more than for [hidden] treasures.**—The Imperf. consec. וַיַּחְפְּרֻהוּ is used here in the sense of the Present, as also elsewhere occasionally (see Ew. § 342. *a*). [The Vav. consec. would indicate that the digging for death is consequent upon waiting for it—the passive waiting and longing being succeeded by the more active digging and searching for it. A terrible picture of the progress of human misery.—E.] It is not necessary (with Hahn and Schlottmann) to translate by the subjunctive form, "who would dig" (would willingly do so). Delitzsch's assumption, that the *fut. consec.* is used "because the sufferers are regarded as now at last dead," is altogether too artificial. The discourse presents rather an ardent longing after death on the part of those who are as yet living—and this longing is described so as to harmonize with the figurative representation of a "digging after pearls or treasures." Comp. chap. xxviii. 1 sq., 9 sq. [Ewald, not inaptly: "for death, like such treasures, seems to come out of earth's most secret womb, even as Pluto is the god of both."] On חפר with accus. of the thing which is dug out, comp. Ex. vii. 24 [showing the incorrectness of the assertion that in the sense of digging, the verb takes only the accusative of the cavity produced by digging, and so justifying the rendering "to dig" here.—E.]

Ver. 22. **Who are joyful. even to rapture**—heightening the thought: *usque ad exultationem*, exactly as in Hos. ix. 1. In like manner the following יָשִׂישׂוּ contains a still further advance in the strength of the thought. ["The verse is a climax, (1) rejoice, (2) to exultation, (3) dance for joy." Dav.

"Who rejoice, even to exultation,
And are triumphant, when they can find out the grave." —Good.]

Vers. 23-26. [The individual application of Job's question.]

Ver. 23 resumes, after the parenthesis contained in the two preceding verses, the dative construction begun in ver. 20, and governed by the verb יִתֵּן of that verse. **To a man whose way is hidden:** *viz.* to *me*, to Job himself;

comp. the following verses, in which the speaker's own person appears as the prominent theme of discourse. [לְגֶבֶר, "to *a* man," a general expression as yet, although evidently the speaker is *thinking* of himself. The verse forms the transition from the general description of the verses preceding to the direct description of the verses following.—E.] For a similar use of the figurative expressions "covering and hedging the way" to represent the act of putting a man in a helpless, forsaken, inextricable situation; comp. chap. xix. 8; also Lam. iii. 5; Is. xl. 27. [Renan translates:

"To the man whose way is covered with darkness,
And whom God has environed with a fatal circle."

"He means, by having his way hid, being bewildered and lost: the world and thought and providence become a labyrinth to him, out of which and in which no path can be found, his speculative and religious belief hopelessly entangled, and his heart palsied and paralyzed by its own conflicting emotions and memories, so that action and thought were impossible, a hedge being about him, his whole life and condition being contradiction and inexplication, a step or two leading to a stand-still in any direction." Dav.]

Ver. 24. **For** [כִּי, personal confirmation of the preceding statement] **instead of my bread comes my sighing.**—לִפְנֵי here not in the local sense, "before" ["in presence of it, and hence in effect along with it. Meaning: even at that season of enjoyment and thankfulness, when food is partaken, I have only pain and sorrow." Con.], but as also in chap. iv. 19; 1 Sam. i. 16, "for, instead of" (comp. the Latin *pro*). [Akin to this is the definition "like," from the idea of comparison involved in that of presence or nearness. So Schult., Dav., Ren.] Less suitable is the temporal construction: "before my food [=before I eat] sighing still comes to me." ["My groans anticipate my food." Wem.] (so Hahn, Hirz., Schl., *etc.*, after the LXX., Vulgate, *etc.*) [The temporal sense is somewhat differently given by Green, *Chrest.*, "before, sooner than; perpetually repeated, with greater frequency than his regular food." The suggestion found in Rosenm., Bar., *etc.*, that Job's disease made his food loathsome in the act of eating gives a meaning needlessly offensive, and is not suited either to the connection or to the terms employed. The fut. תָּבֹא is used in the frequentative sense.—E.] **And my groans pour themselves forth like water**: *i. e.* as incessantly as water, which flows ever onward, or is precipitated from a height. As is evident, a strong comparison, and one which would be greatly weakened by the explanation of Hirzel and others, who find in it an allusion to the water of Job's daily drink, parallel with לחם, his daily bread. For the masc., וַיִּתְּכוּ before the fem. subj. שַׁאֲגֹתָי, comp. chap. xvi. 22; Ewald § 191 *b*. [Future frequentative like תָּבֹא]. For שְׁאָגָה, lit. roaring (chap. iv. 10) in the sense of groaning, the meaning of a sufferer. Comp. Psalm xxii. 2; xxxii. 3.

Ver. 25. **For if I trembled before anything, it forthwith came upon me.** Lit.: "For a fear have I feared, and forthwith it has overtaken me." ["*Let me but think of a terror*," פחד פ׳ is present and concessive, אם understood, *suppose me to fear a fear*, to conceive a terror; it is no sooner conceived than realized: and not past and positive, *I feared a fear*, as if Job, in the height of his felicity, had been haunted by the presentiment of coming calamity, a meaning which is opposed to the whole convictions of antiquity, and contradicted by the anguish and despair of the man under his suffering, which was to him inexplicable and unexpected. The picture refers exclusively to the present misery of the man. . . . *It overtakes me*, וַיֶּאֱתָיֵנִי, *vav consec.* introduces the issue of the dread: the thing dreaded immediately comes." Dav. So Green in *Chrest.*: "The meaning is not that he had apprehensions in his former prosperity, which have now been fulfilled: but all that is dreadful in his esteem has been already, or is likely soon to be (יָבֹא, fut.), realized in his experience. He endures all that he has ever conceived that is frightful."] For the poetic full-sounding form יֶאֱתָיֵנִי, comp. chap. xii. 6; xvi. 22; xxx. 14 (Ew. § 252, *a*. [Green, § 172, 3]).

[Merx, transposing ver. 23, introduces it here, as immediately following ver. 25. His version accordingly reads as follows:

For the Terror, of which I was afraid, overtook me;
And that which with shuddering I looked for came to me,
To the man whose path was covered;
Whom Eloah hedged in round about.

He thus makes the לְ before גֶּבֶר a repetition of the לִי, end of ver. 25, and not of לְעָמֵל, ver. 20, according to the old position. He further would make the verse in its new position an ironical echo of Satan's words in chap. i. 10.—The conjecture is certainly highly ingenious. But there are decisive objections to the change. The first and weightiest is that the irony loses all its force, and the words themselves become all but meaningless in Job's mouth when it is remembered that the words were first spoken by Satan in the heavenly council, where Job was not present. It is an essential part of the mystery of the drama here unfolded that Job knows nothing whatever of the transactions between God and Satan. Any conscious allusion to anything in those transactions on the part of Job would be a blunder of art of which our author is incapable; and without such conscious intent the words lose all their pertinency. Moreover, the verse in its old position, as is remarked in the notes above, furnishes the transition from the general description of vers. 20-22 to the more personal application of vers. 24-26.—E.]

Ver. 26. **I have no quiet, no repose, no rest; and still trouble comes.** On the abrupt brevity of the second member, comp. above, No. 1.—רֹגֶז, here certainly more in the sense of grief, pain, trembling, than of passionate excitement, or rage, and so with a meaning

different from ver. 17: but always (and so in ver. 17, as well as here) of an inward affection, not of external "distress" (Schlott.), or of a "storm" (Hahn), *etc.* Vaihinger's rendering: "restless life," is correct as to sense, but fails of doing justice to the pointed brevity of the expression. [The Vulgate reads this verse interrogatively: "Was I not in safety? had I no rest? was I not in comfort? Yet trouble came." So also the Targ. with curious amplifications: "Did I not dissimulate when it was told me concerning the oxen and the asses? did I not sleep when it was told me concerning the fire?" *etc.*]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. In so far as we may be disposed to find the theme of the following discussion in the preceding chapter, it behooves us in any case to hold for certain that this theme is expressed only partially, and altogether formally, or only, so to speak, in an interrogative form. Job certainly does not come across the question in this discourse. To curse his existence, to ask again and again after the incomprehensible Wherefore of that existence—this constitutes the whole of this violent outbreak of feeling, with which Job initiates the discussion which follows. He does not give the slightest intimation in regard to the right way of solving the problem which torments him—the problem touching the enigma of his sorrowful existence; indeed he makes not the slightest attempt at such a solution. He pours forth in all its bitterness and harshness his despairing lamentation concerning the helpless misery of man, who is become the object of the divine anger. What he puts forth vividly reminds us from beginning to end of those well-known utterances of the Greek poets, which declare it best never to have been born, and next best to die as quickly as possible. Comp. Theognis:

Πάντων μὲν μὴ φῦναι ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἄριστον
μηδ' ἐσιδεῖν αὐγὰς οξέος ἠελίου·
φυντα δ' ὅπως ὤκιστα πύλας Αΐδαο περῆσαι
καὶ κεῖσθαι πολλὴν γῆν ἐπαμησάμενον,—

also the similar expressions of Bacchylides (*Fragm.* 3), Æsop (*Anthol. Gr.* x. 123), Sophocles (*Oed. Col.* 1225: *μὴ φῦναι τὸν ἅπαντα νικᾷ λόγον τὸ δ' ἐπῆν φανῇ, βῆναι κεῖθεν, ὅθεν περ ἥκει, πολὺ δεύτερον, ὡς τάχιστα:* not to have been born surpasses everything which can be said: or if one has come to the light, to descend there whence he came as quickly as possible is by far the second best thing), of Alexis (in Athenæus, *Deipnos.* iii. 124, 6), of Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* vii. 1), *etc.* Especially current in heathen literature, although indeed often enough hinted at by the singers of the Old Testament, especially in the Psalms and the Lamentations of Jeremiah, is this manifoldly uttered lament over the ruined estate, the bankruptcy of the natural man in his unredeemed condition, left to himself, delivered over without remedy to the consequences of sin—a lament which here falls on our ears, without a single ray of comfort from on high to shine on its deep gloom, without any alleviating influence whatever from the hope of a better Hereafter, of which not a trace is as yet visible here.

2. Notwithstanding all this, however, Job does not altogether fall into the tone of those heathen, of those *ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ* (Eph. ii. 12; comp. 1 Thess. iv. 13). He does indeed ask: Why does God give light to the sorrowful, and life to the bitter in soul (ver. 20)? He is not found now, as aforetime (chap. i. 21 seq.), praising God in the midst of his sufferings; in so far as with all earnestness he curses his birth and conception, he is palpably guilty of "sinning with his lips" (chap. ii. 10), instead of exhibiting, as he had previously done, a childlike pious submission. But he by no means goes over to the side of Satan, that enemy of God, who is the author of his temptation. He does not go so far astray as presumptuously to "curse God to His face" (chap. i. 11; ii. 7), as Satan had purposed that he should. He curses indeed the divine act of creation which had given him being, but not the Creator himself; the curse which he pronounces on his day does not put forth that wicked blasphemous sentiment which H. Heine expresses in one of his last poems:

> "'Tis well to die; but better still
> It were had mother never borne us."

His words are words of lamentation and despondency, of doubt and questioning, but not words of blasphemy, nor even of atheistic doubt, renouncing all faith in a living, good and just God. They show, indeed, that the trust which he had hitherto exercised in God had been violently shaken, that there was a wavering and faltering in the child-like obedience which, with touching loyalty, he had hitherto constantly yielded to God. But they are nevertheless only preparatory to the later, and far more passionate outbreaks of discontent with God's dealings to which he gives way. Even when he mentions here a man whose way God has "hidden and hedged about" (ver. 23), he is still far from indulging in any accusation of God as a cruel and unjust persecutor; it is as yet a comparatively harmless *complaint*, in the utterance of which the bitter *accusation* of his later discourses is only remotely anticipated. It is a fact, however, that he who has hitherto lived blamelessly in his fidelity to God does, in the complaints which in this discourse gush forth from his heart, enter on that downward path which, in proportion as his friends prove themselves to be unskilful comforters, and as physicians accomplished only in torturing, not in healing, leads him ever further from God and ever deeper into the abyss of joyless despair. Comp. Delitzsch (i. 84): "Job nowhere says, that he will have nothing more to do with God; he does not renounce his former faithfulness. In the mind of the writer, however, as may be gathered from chap. ii. 10, this speech is to be regarded as the beginning of Job's sinning. If a man, on account of his sufferings, wishes to die early, or not to have been born at all, he has lost his confidence that God, even in the severest suffering, designs his highest good; and this want of confidence is sin. There is, however, a great difference between a man who has in general no trust in God, and in whom suffering only makes this manifest in a terrible manner, and the man with whom trust in God is a habit of his soul,

and is only momentarily repressed, and, as it were, paralyzed. Such interruption of the habitual state may result from the first pressure of unaccustomed suffering; it may then seem as though trust in God were overwhelmed, whereas it has only given way to rally itself again. It is, however, not the greatness of the affliction in itself which shakes his sincere trust in God, but a change of disposition on the part of God, which seems to be at work in the affliction. The sufferer considers himself as forgotten, forsaken and rejected of God; therefore he sinks into despair; and in this despair expression is given to the profound truth (although with regard to the individual that expression is a sinful weakness), that it is better never to have been born, or to be annihilated, than to be rejected of God (comp. Matt. xxvi. 24, *καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος*). In such a condition of spiritual, and, as we know from the prologue, of Satanic temptation (Luke xxii. 31; Eph. vi. 16), is Job. He does not despair when he contemplates his affliction, but when he looks at God through it, who, as though He were become his enemy, has surrounded him with his affliction as with a rampart. . . . It is indeed inconceivable that a New Testament believer, even under the strongest temptation, should utter such imprecations, or especially such a question of doubt as in ver. 20: Wherefore is light given to the miserable? But that an Old Testament believer might very easily become involved in such conflicts of belief may be accounted for by the absence of any express divine revelation to carry his mind beyond the bounds of the present."*

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The above chapter presents as a whole but little material for homiletic use. The description of human misery, as here elaborated by Job, before the coming of the Redeemer, is too much pervaded by a passionate one-sidedness, to be susceptible of practical application in the way of exhortation or encouragement. Unless, as with many of the ancient and most of the Romish commentators, the discourse of Job be idealized, and that which is objectionable in it be set aside, after the fashion of an artificial, moralistic and allegoristic exegesis, it presents more which from the Christian point of view is to be censured than to be accepted as sound and authoritative teaching. It behooves us at all events to treat it *critically*, and from the standpoint of a higher and maturer evangelical perception of the truth to discriminate in Job's complaints and doubtful questionings that which belongs wholly to the Old Testament era, before Christ, and to an imperfectly regenerated humanity, and which is incompatible with the spirit and belief of a suffering saint under the New Dispensation. It behooves us, in a word, to set beside each other *the impatient sufferer, Job, with the most patient of all sufferers, Christ.* It behooves us to show the contrast between him, who, oppressed by the weight of his sufferings, cursed the day of his birth, and Him, who, when confronted by a yet more bitter and terrible cup of suffering, prayed: "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt!" It must be noted that Job, in cursing his existence, and thereby (at least indirectly) calling in question God's goodness and justice, departs from the stand-point of the pious sufferers of the Old Testament, and seemingly betakes himself to that of the heathen in their disconsolate and hopeless estate (comp. Doctrinal Remarks, No. 1), whereas the strongest utterance of lamentation and anguish which Christ puts forth is that exclamation from the Psalms: "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" Let this question of the Crucified One accordingly be taken, and put alongside of the two questions of Job beginning with the interrogative "why" (ver. 11 seq. and ver. 20 seq.), and this comparison be formulated thus: *The "Why" of the suffering Job, and that of Christ;* or: *Job and Christ,* the sorely tried sufferers, and the *different questions addressed by them to God.* Comp. Brentius in his introductory Meditation on the Chap.: Christ exclaims that He is forsaken, because the Lord appears solely in the character of Judge, inflicting sentence of death, thus hiding in the meanwhile His paternal *στοργή*. This the Scriptures call sometimes forsaking, sometimes being asleep. There is the same judicial character in the treatment of Job. For during his first trials (chap. 1-2) he feels the Lord to be as yet his Father, and His hand to be supporting him; and so he stands without difficulty, being founded on a firm rock. But now, the Father being hidden from him, a horrible sentence of death is set before him. No longer therefore do you hear thanksgivings from him, but blasphemies and curses, so that you may say, that the Lord alone is good and true, but that every man, however just and pious, is a liar.

Particular Passages. Vers. 3-10: Osiander: If a man's heart be not ruled and curbed by the grace of the Holy Spirit, it fumes and rages under the cross, instead of bearing it patiently. —Wohlfarth: This saying ("Cursed be the day wherein I was born," *etc.*) is rightly imputed to the tried sufferer as a great sin by the Holy Scripture, and by himself, because the day of our birth comes to us from God, the best Father, and makes us witnesses of so many instances of His grace. . . . Job's case may warn you against incurring such guilt, as to murmur against your Lord, and teach you, so far from cursing the day of your birth, much rather to thank God for it, Psalm cxxxiv. 14 sq.

Vers. 11-19. Brentius: The godly and the ungodly alike declare that death is the last limit of earthly affairs, that it is a quiet deliverance from life's ills. But the one class declare this in unbelief, the other in faith. For the godly

* On the relation of Jeremiah's outburst of despair (chap. xx 14–18), in which the prophet partially imitates in expression the passage before us, to Job's similar lament, comp. Delitzsch (i. 86 seq., who is certainly right in calling attention to the greater brevity of the passage in Jeremiah, and who is for that reason not disinclined, with Hitzig, to attribute to the prophet a momentary paroxysm of excitement, occasioned by the extremely disconsolate condition of his nation at that time); also Nägelsbach on Jeremiah *l. c.*; as also Hengstenberg. *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 120 [see also Lowth's remarks in the Exegetical Notes].

man . . . wishes to depart and to be with Christ, seeing that he has no other release from the sinfulness of the flesh than death, which nevertheless is not his death, but his redemption. But the ungodly, feeling in himself the heavy scourgings of Divine judgment, desires death as rest and deliverance from these scourgings. It is unbelief, however, that produces this wish, which longs after death, not because of the sinfulness of the flesh, but on account of the scourgings.—v. GERLACH. Death seems in this and in similar sections of the book (as is so often the case also in the Psalms) as a state of peace and quiet, it is true, but as being at the same time a pale, empty, shadowy existence, such as it was conceived to be among the heathen, as *e. g.* in the Eleventh Book of the Odyssey. . . . These and similar descriptions we are not to esteem as the human representations appropriate to a crude superstitious age; rather is this to be regarded as the actual condition of the departed without the redemption which is through Christ. It was in this condition that Christ found them after completing His redemptive work on earth, when He preached to the "spirits in prison" (1 Pet. iii. 18 sq.). . . . The awful truth of these descriptions of the realm of the dead in our book and in the Psalms should accordingly fill even the Christian, who still lives in the body and in the world with holy earnestness, when he remembers the character of that state which follows a life out of Christ; and how with these descriptions the narrative which Jesus gives of the rich man in the place of torment links itself.

Vers. 20-26. COCCEIUS: Under the yoke of the law, before the revelation of the Gospel, a burden lay upon our fathers, such as they could neither bear nor lay aside. And although they panted after the liberty of the sons of God, there were still so many hindrances in the way, that they could never enjoy the full blessedness which results from a conscience τετελειωμένη, and inwardly absolved. . . . Whoever, therefore, of them cursed his life should be regarded by us not so much as resisting the ordinance of God, or spurning His kindness, but rather as panting after the liberty of the Gospel, while struggling with the yoke of the law.—ZEYSS (on vers. 23-24): God often shuts up the way of His children with the thorns of affliction, in order that they may never turn aside out of it; He knows, however, how easily to open it again, after He has tried them first. . . . The bread of tears is the most common food of pious Christians in this world; it is their comfort, however, that the true bread of joy will certainly follow hereafter; Ps. lxxx 6; cii. 10; cxxvi. 5, 6; John xvi. 20. HENGSTENBERG: The answer to Job's questions is this: God chastises the pious in righteous retribution, and for their good, but He does not deliver them over to death. There is no "wretched one" (ver. 21) in Job's sense of the term, understanding by it, as he does, one who is absolutely miserable. The man who should be permanently miserable would be so in consequence of his sin, as the penalty of his delinquency, the suffering which should lead him to God, and put him in spiritual union with Him, having driven him away from God.

FIRST SERIES OF CONTROVERSIAL DISCOURSES.

THE ENTANGLEMENT IN ITS BEGINNING.

CHAPTER IV—XIV.

I. Eliphaz and Job: Chap. IV—VII.

A.—The Accusation of Eliphaz: Man must not speak against God like Job.

CHAPTER IV—V.

1. Introductory reproof of Job on account of his unmanly complaint, by which he could only incur God's wrath:

CHAPTER IV. 2—11.

1 Then Eliphaz the Temanite answered and said:
2 If we assay to commune with thee, wilt thou be grieved?
but who can withhold himself from speaking?
3 Behold, thou hast instructed many,
and thou hast strengthened the weak hands.
4 Thy words have upholden him that was falling,
and thou hast strengthened the feeble knees.
5 But now it is come upon thee, and thou faintest;
it toucheth thee, and thou art troubled.

6 Is not this thy fear, thy confidence,
thy hope, and the uprightness of thy ways?

7 Remember, I pray thee, who ever perished, being innocent?
or where were the righteous cut off?
8 Even as I have seen, they that plough iniquity,
and sow wickedness, reap the same.
9 By the blast of God they perish,
and by the breath of His nostrils are they consumed.
10 The roaring of the lion, and the voice of the fierce lion,
and the teeth of the young lions are broken.
11 The old lion perisheth for lack of prey,
and the stout lion's whelps are scattered abroad.

2. An account of a heavenly revelation, which declared to him the wrongfulness and foolishness of weak sinful man's raving against God:

CHAP. IV. 12—V. 7.

12 Now a thing was secretly brought to me,
and mine ear received a little thereof,
13 in thoughts from the visions of the night,
when deep sleep falleth on men—
14 fear came upon me, and trembling,
which made all my bones to shake.
15 Then a spirit passed before my face;
the hair of my flesh stood up!
16 It stood, but I could not discern the form thereof:
an image was before mine eyes;
there was silence, and I heard a voice, saying,

17 "Shall mortal man be more just than God?
shall a man be more pure than his Maker?
18 Behold, He put no trust in His servants;
and His angels He charged with folly:
19 how much less in them that dwell in houses of clay,
whose foundation is in the dust,
which are crushed before the moth?
20 They are destroyed from morning to evening;
they perish forever without any regarding it.
21 Doth not their excellency which is in them go away?
they die, even without wisdom."

CHAP. V. 1 Call now, if there be any that will answer thee;
and to which of the saints wilt thou turn?
2 For wrath killeth the foolish man,
and envy slayeth the silly one.
3 I have seen the foolish taking root;
but suddenly I cursed his habitation.
4 His children are far from safety,
and they are crushed in the gate, neither is there any to deliver them:
5 whose harvest the hungry eateth up,
and taketh it even out of the thorns,
and the robber swalloweth up their substance.

6 Although affliction cometh not forth of the dust,
neither doth trouble spring out of the ground;
7 yet man is born unto trouble,
as the sparks fly upward.

3. Admonition to repentance, as the only means by which Job can recover God's favor and his former happy estate:

CHAP. V. 8—27.

8 I would seek unto God,
and unto God would I commit my cause;
9 which doeth great things and unsearchable,
marvellous things without number;
10 who giveth rain upon the earth,
and sendeth waters upon the fields;—
11 to set up on high those that be low,
that those which mourn may be exalted to safety,

12 He disappointeth the devices of the crafty,
so that their hands cannot perform their enterprise.
13 He taketh the wise in their own craftiness,
and the counsel of the froward is carried headlong.
14 They meet with darkness in the day-time,
and grope in the noonday as in the night.
15 But He saveth the poor from the sword, from their mouth,
and from the hand of the mighty.
16 So the poor hath hope,
and iniquity stoppeth her mouth.

17 Behold, happy is the man whom God correcteth;
therefore despise not thou the chastening of the Almighty.
18 For He maketh sore, and bindeth up;
He woundeth, and His hands make whole.
19 He shall deliver thee in six troubles;
yea, in seven there shall no evil touch thee.
20 In famine He shall redeem thee from death,
and in war from the power of the sword.
21 Thou shalt be hid from the scourge of the tongue,
neither shalt thou be afraid of destruction when it cometh.

22 At destruction and famine thou shalt laugh;
neither shalt thou be afraid of the beasts of the earth.
23 For thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field,
and the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee.
24 And thou shalt know that thy tabernacle shall be in peace;
and thou shalt visit thy habitation, and shalt not sin.
25 Thou shalt know also that thy seed shall be great,
and thine offspring as the grass of the earth.
26 Thou shalt come to thy grave in a full age,
like as a shock of corn cometh in his season.
27 Lo this, we have searched it, so it is:
hear it, and know thou it for thy good.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1.—Ver. 1. **Then answered Eliphaz, . . . and said.**—It is beyond question the poet's aim in this first discourse of Eliphaz to put forward as the first arraigner of Job a man venerable through age and experience, calm and dispassionate, godly after his manner, but at the same time entangled in a one-sided eudemonism and theory of work-righteousness. It is a genuine sage who discourses here: not indeed another Job, but still a character of marked superiority over his two associates, Bildad and Zophar, in experimental insight and sterling personal worth, who here "with the self-confident pathos of age and the mien of a prophet" communicates his experiences, annexing thereto warnings, exhortations and admonitions. ["He, the oldest and most illustrious, the leader and spokesman, appears here at once in his greatest brilliancy. What a fullness in the argument, which at first sight seems unanswerable! How well he knows how to produce illustrations and proofs from revelation and from experience, from among the inhabitants of heaven and of

earth! And what poetic beauty irradiates it all! How he strikes with equal skill each various chord of mild reproach, of self assured conviction, of the awful, of the elevated, of calm instruction, of friendly appeal! How clearly and sharply marked are its divisions, alike as to thought and poetic form! Every strophe is a rounded completed whole in itself: and with what freedom, and, at the same time, with what internal necessity does one strophe link itself to another! One might say that as an artistic discourse this part is the completest in the whole book of Job, that it seems as though the poet wished to show at the very beginning the perfection of his art." SCHLOTTMANN. "The speech is wonderfully artistic and exhaustive, unmistakably manifesting the speaker's high standing and self-conscious superiority, and his conviction of Job's guilt, yet showing a desire to spare him, even while being faithful with him, and to lead him back to rectitude and humility rather by an exhibition of the goodness of God than of his own sin. The speech is exquisitely climactic, rising, as Ewald says, from the faint whisper and tune of the summer wind to the loud and irresistible thunder of the wintry storm." DAV.]

The discourse opens with a sharp attack on Job's comfortless and hopeless lamentation, as something which was adapted to bring down on him God's wrath, which, as experience shows, is visited on every ungodly man (chap. iv. 2-11). He strengthens this admonition by describing a heavenly vision which had appeared to him during the night, and which had spoken to him, teaching him how foolish and how wrong it is for man to rebel against God (chap. iv. 12—v. 7). The close of his discourse consists of a kindly admonition to Job to return accordingly to God in a spirit of prayer and penitent humility, in which case God would certainly deliver him out of his misery, and exalt him out of his present low estate (chap. v. 8-27).* The first and shortest of these three divisions forms at the same time the first of the five double strophes, into which the entire discourse falls. The two following divisions are subdivided each into two double strophes of almost equal length, as follows: Div. II.: *a.* chap. iv. 12-21; *b.* chap. v. 1-7.—Div. III.: *a.* chap. v. 8-16; *b.* chap. v. 17-27.

2. *First Division and Double Strophe:* Introductory reproof of Job's faint-hearted lamentation, whereby he could only call down on himself God's anger: chap. iv. 2-11.

First Strophe: vers. 2-6. Retrospective reference to Job's former godly and righteous life.

Ver. 2. **Should one venture a word to thee, wilt thou be grieved?**—[The friendly courtesy of these opening words of Eliphaz is worthy of note. They are at once dignified, sympathetic and considerate. At the same time, as Dillmann observes, there is a certain "coldness and measured deliberation" about them, which not improbably grated somewhat on Job's sensibilities, yearning, as his heart now did, for more tangible and soulfull sympathy. Eliphaz speaks less as a sympathizing friend, than as a fatherly adviser, and a benevolent but critical sage.—E.] The interrogative particle הֲ, referring to the principal verb תִּלְאֶה, is prefixed to the first word of the sentence. [See Green, *Gr.* § 283, *a.*] It is immediately followed by an elliptical conditional clause, נִסָּה דָבָר אֵלֶיךָ (comp. the same construction in ver. 21; also in Num. xvi. 22; Jer. viii. 4), forming an antecedent clause to the principal verb. To be rendered accordingly: "Wilt thou find it irksome, take it hard, will it offend thee, if one attempts a word to thee?" נִסָּה is most simply regarded as third pers. sing. Piel of נסה, *tentare*, after Eccles. vii. 23. It is less natural, with Umbreit, *etc.*, to take it as Pret. Niph. in the same sense, or following the old versions, to see in it a variant form of נשׂא (comp. Ps. iv. 7), as though it were נָשָׂא דבר, "to speak a word:" chap. xxvii. 1; Ps. xv. 3: lxxxi. 3. In the latter case the word must be taken either as 3d sing. Niph. in the passive sense ("should a word be spoken") or, more probably, as 1st plur. Imperf. Kal ("should we speak"), in which latter case again two interpretations are possible, namely either: "wilt thou, should we speak a word against thee, take offence" (Rosenm., *etc.*, comp. the Ancient Versions)? or: "shall we speak a word against thee, with which thou wilt be offended" (Ewald, *Bib. Jahrb.* ix. 37; Böttcher)? Against the first rendering may be urged the unusual construction of an Imperf. in an elliptical conditional sentence; against the latter the unheard of transitive rendering which it assumes for לאה. [In favor of taking נסה here in the sense of: "to attempt, to venture," it may be said: (1) This meaning is entirely legitimate. (2) It is more expressive. (3) It is more in harmony with the courtesy which marks these opening words of Eliphaz. Hengstenberg's rendering is somewhat different from any of those given above: "Shall one venture a word to thee, who art wearied?" But the elliptical construction thus assumed seems less simple and natural than the one adopted above.—E.] **And yet to hold back from words [or speaking] who is able?** For the use of עָצַר with בְּ, "to hold back from [or, in respect to] anything," comp. chap. xii. 15; xxix. 9. For the sharpened form יַעְצֹר instead of יַעֲצֹר, see Ew. § 245, *b.*—מִלִּין, Aram. plur. ending (comp. chap. xii. 11; xv. 13) of מִלָּה, which occurs in our book thirty times, whereas מִלִּים occurs but ten times in all.

Ver. 3. **Behold, thou hast admonished many.**—יִסַּרְתָּ, lit. thou hast chastised, disciplined, namely, with words of reproof and loving admonition. The Perf. here points back to Job's normal conduct in former days when revered by all, and thus furnishes the standard by which the time of the following Imperf. verb is to be determined. The general sense of vers. 3-4 is: "Thou wast wont formerly to conduct thyself in regard to the sufferings of others so correctly and blamelessly, to show such a proper under-

* In all essentials Coccelus had already recognized these three divisions in the discourse of Eliphaz, both as regards the lines of separation between them and the significance of their contents.

standing of the cause and aim of heavy judgments inflicted by God, to deal with sufferings in a way so wise and godlike! But now when suffering has overtaken thyself. *etc.* . . . **And slack hands hast thou strengthened.**— "Slack hands:" a sensuous figure representing faint-heartedness and despondency, as also in 2 Sam. iv. 1; Is. xxxv. 3. In the last member of ver. 4 the expression "stumbling [lit. bowing, *i. e.* sinking] knees" is used in essentially the same sense (and so in Heb. xii. 12).

Ver. 5. **Because it is now come to thee,** to wit, suffering, misfortune. This construction of the impersonal or neutral תָּבוֹא is suggested by the context, [and this indefinite statement of the subject is at once more considerate and impressive than if it had been expressed.—E.] כִּי is construed by Hirzel, Hahn, Schlottmann, Delitzsch, *etc.*, as a particle of time: "Now when it is come to thee." But the position, כִּי עַתָּה favors rather the causal rendering of the first particle, "*because* now," *etc.* Comp. Dillmann. [Others explain by supplying an omitted clause: *e. g.* "I say these things because," *etc.* Ewald: "How strange *that* thou now faintest." The adversative use of כִּי, ("*but* now"), except after a negative clause, is too doubtful to be relied on here.—E.] **It toucheth thee** (תִּגַּע עָדֶיךָ, comp. Is. xvi. 8; Jer. iv. 10; Mic. i. 9), **and thou art confounded.** וַתִּבָּהֵל, lit. "art seized with terror, and thereby put out of countenance;" comp. chap. xxi. 6; xxiii. 15. ["It is unfair to Eliphaz to suppose that he utters his wonder with any sinister tone —as if he would hint that Job found it somewhat easier to counsel others than console himself; his astonishment is honest and honestly expressed that a man who could say such deep things on affliction, and things that reached so far into the heart of the afflicted, that could lay bare such views of providence and the uses of adversity, and thus invigorate the weak, should himself be so feeble and desponding when suffering came to his own door." DAV. Doubtless the words express surprise on the part of Eliphaz, and were spoken with a kind intent; but also with a certain severity, a purpose to probe Job's conscience, to lead him to self-examination, and to the discovery of the hidden evil within, of the existence of which Eliphaz, with his theodicy, could have no doubt.—E.]

Ver. 6. **Is not thy godly fear thy confidence? thy hope—the uprightness of thy ways?** The order of the words is chiastic [decussated, inverted]: in the first member the subject, יִרְאָתְךָ, stands at the beginning; in the second member it is found at the end, תֹּם דְּרָכֶיךָ, evidently synonymous with יִרְאָה. A similar case is found in chap. xxxvi. 26. Altogether too artificial and forced, and too much at variance with the principles which govern the structure of Hebrew verse, is the explanation attempted by Delitzsch: "Is not thy piety thy confidence, thy hope? And the uprightness of thy ways?" (*viz.* and is not the uprightness of thy ways thy confidence and thy hope?) Eliphaz twice again makes use of the ellipsis יִרְאָה for יִרְאַת אֱלֹהִים in his discourses (chap. xv. 4 and xxii. 4: and comp. הַדַּעַת, Hos. iv. 6 for דעת אלהם). ["The word *fear* is the most comprehensive term for that mixed feeling called piety, the contradictory reverence and confidence, awe and familiarity, which, like the centripetal and centrifugal forces, keep man in his orbit around God." DAV.] כִּסְלָה, confidence, assurance (the same which elsewhere=כֶּסֶל, chap. viii. 14; xxxi. 24), not "folly" (LXX.). [The Vav in the second member is the Vav of the apodosis, or of relation. See Green, *Gr.* § 287, 3.—The rendering of E. V.: "Is not this thy fear, thy confidence, thy hope, and the uprightness of thy ways?" overlooks the parallelism, and is unintelligible. Some (Hupfeld, Merx) cut the knot by transposing תִּקְוָתְךָ to the end of the verse. The construction as it stands is certainly peculiar, yet not enough so to justify any change. Moreover it seems to have escaped all the commentators that *the very harshness and singularity of the construction is intentional*, having for its object to arrest more forcibly the attention of Job, to stir up his consciousness on the subject of his piety and rectitude, and thus to further the process of probing his soul on which Eliphaz is in this part of his discourse engaged. —E.]

Vers. 7-11. *Second Strophe:* More explicit expansion of ver. 6, wherein it is shown as the conclusion of experience that the pious *never* fall into dire affliction, whereas on the contrary the ungodly and the wicked do so often and inevitably.

Ver. 7. **Remember now! who that was innocent has perished?** ["It would be unfair to Eliphaz (as well as quite beside his argument, the purpose of which is to reprove Job's impatience, and lead him back by repentance to God), to suppose that he argued in this way: Who ever perished being innocent? Thou hast perished; therefore thy piety and the integrity of thy ways have been a delusion. On the contrary his argument is: Where were the pious ever cut off? Thou art pious: why is not thy piety thy hope? Why fall, being a pious man, and as such of necessity to be finally prospered by God, into such irreligious and wild despair? Eliphaz acknowledges Job's piety, and makes it the very basis of his exhortation; of course, though pious, he had been guilty (as David was) of particular heinous sins, which explained and caused his calamities. The fundamental axiom of the friends produced here both positively and negatively as was meet for the first announcement of it by Eliphaz is, that whatever appearance to the contrary and for a time, yet ultimately and always the pious were saved and the wicked destroyed." DAV.] The הוּא annexed to the מִי gives greater vivacity to the question; comp. chap. xiii. 19; xvii. 3; also the similar phrase מִי זֶה (Gesen. § 122, 2).

Ver. 8. **So far as I have seen, they who plough mischief and sow ruin reap the same.**—כַּאֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי, not "when (or if) I saw" (Vaih., Del.), for this construction of כאשר does not allow the omission of the Vav Consec. before

the apodosis. But either the whole sentence is to be taken as a statement of the comparison with that which precedes, to which it is annexed, thus: "As I have seen: they who plough . . . reap the same" (Hirz., Schlott. [Con.]). Or we are to explain with most of the later commentators;" "So far as I have seen," *i. e.* so far as my experience goes (Rosenm., Arnh., Stick., Welte, Heiligst., Ew., Dillm. [Dav., Merx], *etc.*). אָוֶן, lit. "nothingness," then "sin, wickedness, mischief."—עָמָל as in chap. iii. 10. The agricultural figure of sowing (or ploughing) and reaping, emphatically representing the organically necessary connection of cause and effect in the domain of the moral life; to be found also in Hos. viii. 7; x. 13; Prov. xxii. 8; Gal. vi. 7 seq.; 2 Cor. ix. 6, and often.

Ver. 9. **By the breath of Eloah they perish**: like plants, which a burning hot wind scorches (Gen. xli. 6). The discourse thus carries forward the preceding figure. On the use of the divine name אֱלוֹהַּ in our poem, see Introd. § 5. The נִשְׁמַת אֱלוֹהַּ is in *b.* still more specifically defined as רוּחַ אַפּוֹ, lit. "breath of his nostril," *i. e.* blast of his anger. Both synonyms are still more closely bound together in Ps. xviii. 16. ["As the previous verse describes retribution as a natural necessity founded in the order of the world, so does this verse trace back this same order of the world to the divine causality." SCHLOTT. Lee, criticising the A. V.'s rendering of נְשָׁמָה in the first member by "blast," says: "I know of no instance in which the word will bear this sense. It rather means a slight or gentle breathing. . . . . The sentiment seems to be: they perish from the gentlest breathing of the Almighty . . It is added: *and from the blast of his nostril, or wrath, they come to an end.* From the construction here, *blast* or *storm* is probably meant. See Ps. xi. 6; Hos. xiii. 15, *etc.*, and if so, we shall have a sort of climax here."]

Vers. 10, 11. From the vegetable kingdom the figurative representation of the discourse passes over to that of animal life, in order to show, by the destruction of a family of lions, how the insolent pride of the wicked is crushed by the judgment of God.—**The cry of the lion, and the voice of the roaring lion, and the teeth of the young lions are broken; the strong [lion] perishes for lack of prey, and the whelps of the lioness are scattered.**—[Merx rejects these two verses as spurious; but their appropriateness in the connection will appear from what is said below.—E.] Not less than five different names of the lion are used in this description, showing the extent to which the lion abounded in the lands of the Bible, and especially in the Syro-Arabian country, which was the scene of our poem. The usual name אַרְיֵה stands first; next follows the purely poetic designation, שַׁחַל, "the roarer" (Vaih.), comp. ch. x. 16; xxviii. 8; Ps. xci. 13; Prov. xxvi. 13; Hos. v. 14; xiii. 7; then in ver. 10 *b* comes the standard expression for young lions, כְּפִירִים, comp. Judg. xiv. 5; Ps. xvii. 12; civ. 21; then follows in ver. 11 *a* לַיִשׁ, "the strong one," from לִישׁ, "to be strong," found again in Prov. xxx. 30, and being thus limited to the diction of poetry, and finally in ver. 11 *b* the no less poetic לָבִיא, which here, as well as in ch. xxxviii 29; Gen. xlix. 9; Num. xxiv. 9, denotes the lioness, for which, however, we have also the distinctive feminine form לְבִיָּא in Ezek. xix. 2. ["The young lions are mentioned along with the old in order to exemplify the destruction of the haughty sinner with all his household." SCHLOTT.] נִתָּעוּ (from נתע, *frangere, conterere*, an Aramaizing alternate form of נתץ, comp. Ps. lviii. 7) signifies: "are shattered, are dashed out; ' an expression which, strictly taken, suits only the last subject שִׁנֵּי כ, but may by zeugma be referred to both the preceding subjects, to which such a verb as "are silenced" would properly correspond. Observe the use of the perf. נִתָּעוּ in making vividly present the sudden destruction of the rapacious lions, which is then followed in ver. 11, first by a present partic. (אֹבֵד), then by a present Imperf. (יִתְפָּרָדוּ), describing them in their present condition, shattered, broken in strength, and restrained in their rage. [Delitzsch remarks that "the partic. אֹבֵד is a stereotype expression for wandering about prospectless and helpless," a definition which here, as well as in the passages to which he refers, would considerably weaken the sense. See Hengsten. *in loco.*—E.] מִבְּלִי, "for the lack of;" the same as "without;" comp. ver. 20; ch. vi. 6; xxiv. 7, 8; xxxi. 19. ["From wicked man his imagination suddenly shifts to his analogue among beasts. the lion, and there appears before him one old and helpless, his teeth dashed out, his roar silenced, dying for lack of prey, and being abandoned by all his kind; a marvellous picture of a sinner once powerful and bloody, but now destitute of power, and with only his bloody instincts remaining to torture and mock his impotency." DAV.]

3. *Second Division:* describing a heavenly revelation which declared to him the wrongfulness and the folly of frail, sinful man's anger against God.—*a. Second Double Strophe: the heavenly revelation itself,* introduced by a description of the awful nocturnal vision through which it was communicated: vers. 12-21.

First Strophe: Vers. 12-16. The night-vision.

Ver. 12. **And to me there stole a word.**—Lit. "and to me there was stolen, there was brought in a stealthy, mysterious manner." The imperf. יְגֻנָּב is ruled by the following imperf. consec. ["The speaker is thrown back again by the imagination into the imposing circumstances of the eventful night. . . . The Pual implies that the oracle was sent." DAV.] The separation of the ו, which properly belongs to the verb יְגֻנָּב, but which is placed here, at the beginning of the verse, before אֵלַי ["because he desires, with pathos, to put himself prominent," DEL.] rests on the fact that that which is now about to be related, and especially the דָּבָר which came to Eliphaz, is hereby designated as some-

thing new, as something additional to that which has already been observed. [This separation is quite often met with in poetry. Comp. Ps. lxix. 22; lxxviii. 15, 26, 29, *etc.* See Ew. *Gr.* § 346 *b.*] **And mine ear caught a whisper therefrom:** *i. e.*, proceeding therefrom, occasioned by that communication of a mysterious דבר. The מן in מֶנְהוּ (poetic form, for מִמֶּנּוּ, Ew. § 263 *b*) is therefore causative, not partitive, as Hahn and Delitzsch regard it. שֵׁמֶץ signifies here, as in chap. xxvi. 14, a faint whisper, or lisp [or murmur], ψιθυρισμός, susurrus, not "a little, a minimum," as the Targ., Pesh., the Rabbis [and the Eng. Ver.] render it. The word is to be derived either from שָׁמַע, thus denoting a faint, indistinct impression on the ear (Arnheim, Delitzsch), or from the primitive root, שׁם, דם, to which, according to Dillmann, who produces its Æthiopic cognate, the idea attaches of "lip-closing, dumbness, and low-speaking." [Here the word "is designed to show the value of such a solemn communication, and to arouse curiosity." Del. "The whole description of the way in which the communication was made indicates, perhaps, the naturalness and calmness and peace of the intercourse of man's spirit and God's—how there is nothing forced or strained in God's communication to man—it droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven upon the place beneath—and at the same time man's impaired capacity and receptiveness and dullness of spiritual hearing." Dav. "The word was too sacred and holy to come loudly and directly to his ear." Del.

Vers. 13–16 present a more specific description of that which is stated generally in ver. 12.

Ver. 13. **In the confused thoughts from visions of the night, when deep sleep falls on men.**—Whether with most expositors we connect these words with the verse preceding, as a supplementary determination of the time, or as a preliminary statement of time connected with what follows (Umbreit, Dillmann, Conant, *etc.*), matters not as to the sense.—שְׂעִפִּים are here, as also in ch. xx. 2, "thoughts proceeding like branches from the heart as their root, and intertwining themselves" (Delitzsch). [The root, according to Del. and Fürst, is שָׂעַף, to bind; according to Ges., Dav., *etc.*, it is for סָעַף, to split; hence here and ch. xx. 2 "fissures, divisions, divided counsels (1 Kings xviii. 21), thoughts running away into opposite ramifications, distracting doubts." Dav.] The following מִן indicates that these thoughts proceed from visions of the night, *i. e.*, dream-visions; from which, however, it does not follow that Eliphaz intends to refer what he is about to narrate purely to the sphere of the life of dreams. For the determination of the time in our verse is altogether general, as the second member in particular shows. Hengstenberg's position that Eliphaz includes himself among the "men" designated here as those on whom deep sleep falls, and that he accordingly represents his vision as literally a dream-vision, has no foundation in the context. (Comp. still further Passavant's remark on ver. 13 under the head "Homiletical and Practical"). ["There are *three* things contained in the genetic process or progress towards this oracle. First, visions of the night, raising deep questions of man's relation to God, but leaving them unsolved, short flights of the spirit into superhuman realms, catching glimpses of mysteries, too short to be self-revealing—these are the visions. Second, the perturbed, perplexed, and meditative condition of the spirit following these, when it presses into the darkness of the visions for a solution, and is rocked and tossed with fear or longing—the thoughts from the visions. And third, there is the new revelation clearing away the doubts and calming the perturbation of the soul, a revelation attained either by the spirit rising convulsively out of its trouble, and piercing by a new divinely-given energy the heart of things before hidden; or by the truth being communicated to it by some Divine messenger or word." Dav. The oracle was conveyed by a dream, "because in the patriarchal age such oracles were of most frequent occurrence, as may be seen, *e. g.* in the book of Genesis." Ewald]. For תַּרְדֵּמָה, "deep sleep," such as is wont to be experienced about the hour of midnight, in contrast to ordinary sleep, שֵׁנָה, and to the light, wakeful slumber of morning, תְּנוּמָה, comp. Gen. ii. 21; xv. 12; 1 Sam. xxvi. 12; also below, ch. xxxiii. 15, where Elihu has a description imitative of the passage before us. ["תַּרְדֵּמָה is the deep sleep related to death and ecstasy, in which man sinks back from outward life into the remotest ground of his inner life." Del. *Per contra* Davidson says: "תרדמה is used generally of ecstatic, divinely-induced sleep, yet not exclusively (Prov. xix. 15, and verb, Jon. i. 5), and not here. The meaning is that the vision came, not at the hour when prophetic slumber is wont to fall on men (and that El. was under such), but simply at the hour when men were naturally under deep sleep. El. was thus alone with the vision, and the solitary encounter accounts for the indelible impression its words and itself left on him."]

Ver. 14. **Shuddering [fear] came upon me** (קְרָאַנִי, from קרה=קרא, to meet, befall, come upon, comp. Gen. xlii. 38), **and trembling, and sent a shudder through the multitude of my bones:** the subject of הִפְחִיד being the "shuddering" and the "trembling," not "the ghostlike something" (as Delitzsch says), of which Eliphaz first proceeds to speak in the following verse. [The perf. vbs. in this verse are pluperf. "*A terror had fallen upon me*, like a certain vague lull which precedes the storm, as if nature were uneasily listening and holding in her breath for the coming calamity." So Davidson.—רֹב in poetry is often used for כֹּל, all. The terror striking through his *bones* indicates how deeply and thoroughly he was agitated. Bones, as elsewhere in similar passages, for the substratum of the bodily frame.—E.]

Ver. 15. **And a spirit passed before me;** lit.: **passes before me** (יַחֲלֹף, "glides, flits"); for the description as it grows more vivid introduces in this and the following verse the imperf. in place of the introductory perf. For רוּחַ in the sense of "a spirit," the apparition of a spirit or an angel, comp. 1 Kings xxii. 21. So cor-

rectly the ancient Versions, Umbreit, Ewald, Heiligstedt, Hahn [Good, Lee, Wem., Ber., Noy., Bar., Carey], *etc.* On the other hand [Schult.], Rosenm., Hirzel, Böttcher, Stickel, Delitzsch, Dillmann [Schlott., Ren., Rod., Merx] render: "and a breath [of wind] passed over me," a current of air, such as is wont to accompany spirit-communications from the other world (comp. ch. xxxviii. 1; 1 Kings xix. 11; Acts ii. 2, *etc.*). The description in the following verse, however, does not agree with this rendering, especially the יַעֲמֹד, which is unmistakably predicated of the רוּחַ in the sense of "an angel, a personal spirit." [It needs no argument to prove that the "spirit" here introduced is a good spirit, although it may be mentioned in passing that Codurcus, the Jesuit commentator, followed by some others, regards him as an evil spirit. This notion is advanced in the interest of the theory that Job's friends are throughout to be condemned.—E.]—**The hairs of my body bristled up.**—תְּסַמֵּר, Piel intensive, "to rise up mightily, to bristle up." שַׂעֲרָה, elsewhere the individual hair (*capillus*). here a collective word (*coma, crines*), of the same structure as עֲנָנָה, ch. iii. 5. [The expression שַׂעֲרַת בְּשָׂרִי, lit.: "the hair of my flesh,' shows that the terror, which in ver. 14 thrilled through all his bones, here creeps over his whole body.—E.]

Ver. 16. **It stood there, I discerned not its appearance**—The subj. of יַעֲמֹד is not the "unknown something" of the preceding verse (Rosenm., *etc.*), but the spirit, as it is already known to be, which has hitherto flitted before Eliphaz, but which now stands still to speak (comp. 1 Sam. iii. 10).—**An image before mine eyes**; תְּמוּנָה, the word which in respect to spiritual phenomena is most nearly expressive of "form." In Num. xii. 8; Ps. xvii. 15 it is used of the *μορφή* or *δόξα* of God. Here it is very suitably used to describe the spiritual or angelic apparition, fading into indefiniteness; for it refers back to רוּחַ, the true subject of יַעֲמֹד, being placed after it in apposition to it. —**A murmur and a voice I heard.**—דְּמָמָה וָקוֹל, a "lisping murmur and a voice," a hendiadys, signifying a murmur uttering itself in articulate tones, a "murmuring or whispering voice" (Hahn). [So Ges., Fürst, Words., Dillm., Del., Dav.]. Umbreit (1st Ed.), Schlottmann [Eng. Ver., Good, Lee, Con., Carey, Ren.] take דְּמָמָה, but unsuitably, in the sense of "silence." For the true sense comp. 1 Kings xix. 12. [Of those who take דממה in the sense of silence there are two classes, the one, represented by the English Version and commentators, separates between the "silence" and the "voice:" first the silence, then the voice, as Renan: "in the midst of the silence I heard a voice;" the other, represented by Schlottmann and Hengstenberg, combine the two terms as a hendiadys, "a commingling of both, a faint, muffled voice" (Hengst.) Schlottmann quotes from Gersonides as follows: "And I heard his wonderful words as though they were compounded of the voice and of silence." Burke in his Treatise on the Sublime and Beautiful has the following remarks on this vision: "There is a passage in the book of Job amazingly sublime, and this sublimity is principally due to the terrible uncertainty of the thing described. . . . We are first prepared with the utmost solemnity for the vision; we are first terrified before we are let even into the obscure cause of our emotion; but when this grand cause of terror makes its appearance, what is it? is it not wrapt up in the shades of its own incomprehensible darkness, more awful, more striking, more terrible than the liveliest description, than the clearest painting, could possibly represent it?"—E.]

Second strophe, vers. 17-21. The contents of the revelation communicated through the vision.

Ver. 17. **Is a mortal just before Eloah, or before his Maker is a man pure?**—Already in this question is contained the substance of the revelation; vers. 18-21 only furnish the proof of this proposition from the universal sinfulness of men. מִן here is not comparative, "more just than" (Vulg., Luth. [E. V.], *etc.*), but "from the side of any one" [Gesenius: "marking the author of a judgment or estimate: here in the judgment or sight of God."] Hence "is a man just from the side of God?" *i. e.*, from God's stand-point; or, more briefly: "before God" (LXX.: *ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ*). In the same sense with this מִן=*coram* (for which comp. Num. xvi. 9; xxxii. 22), we find עִם in ch. ix. 2; xxv. 4; and בְּעֵינֵי in ch. xv. 15; xxv. 5. [According to the other (the comparative) rendering, the sentiment is: "Whoever censures the course of Providence, by complaining of his own lot (as Job had done), claims to be more just than God, the equity of whose government he thus arraigns." See Conant, Davidson, *etc.*]

Ver. 18. **Lo, in His servants He trusteth not; and to His angels He imputes error.** —"Servants" (עֲבָדִים) and "angels" (מַלְאָכִים) are only different designations of the same superhuman beings, who in ch. i. 6 are called "sons of God." Eliphaz refers to them here in order to introduce a conclusion *a majori ad minus.* שִׂים בְּ, lit.: "to place anything in one," *i. e.*, to ascribe anything to one, *imputare.* Comp. 1 Sam. xxii. 15.—תָּהֳלָה is most correctly explained by Dillmann, after the Ethiopic, as signifying "error, imperfection" (so also Ewald [Fürst, Delitzsch], and still earlier Schnurrer, after the Arabic). The derivation from הלל, according to which it would mean "folly, presumption" (Kimchi, Gesenius [Schlottmann, Renan], *etc.*), is etymologically scarcely to be admitted [on account of the half vowel, and still more the absence of the Daghesh. Del.] The ancient versions seem only to have guessed at the sense (Vulg., *pravum quid;* LXX., *σκολιόν τι;* Chald., *iniquitas;* Pesch., *stupor*). Hupfeld needlessly attempts to amend after ch. xxiv. 12, where the parallel word תִּפְלָה is given as the object of שִׂים בְּ. ["It is not meant that the good spirits positively sin, as if sin were a natural necessary

consequence of their creature-ship and finite existence, but that even the holiness of the good spirits is never equal to the absolute holiness of God, and that this deficiency is still greater in man, who is both spiritual and corporeal, who has earthiness as the basis of his original nature." Del.]

Ver. 18. **How much more they who dwell in houses of clay.**—אַף here introducing the conclusion of the syllogism *a majori ad minus*, begun in ver. 18, and so=אַף כִּי (ch. ix. 14; xv. 16; xxv. 6); here, as in 2 Sam. xvi. 11, to be translated by *quanto magis*, because a positive premise (ver. 18 *b*.) precedes; comp. Ewald, § 354, c. Those "who dwell in houses of clay" are men generally. There is no particular reference to those who are poor and miserable. For the expression בָּתֵּי־חֹמֶר does not point to men's habitations, but to the material, earthly, frail bodies with which they are clothed, their *φθαρτὰ σώματα* (comp. ch. xxxiii. 6; Wisd. ix. 15; 2 Cor. v. 1, as well as the Mosaic account of creation which lies at the foundation of all these representations; see Gen. ii. 7; iii. 19). It may be said further that the figurative and indefinite character of the language here justifies no particular deductions either in respect to the nature and constitution of angels (to wit, whether in Eliphaz's conception they are altogether incorporeal, or whether they are endowed with supra-terrestrial corporeality), nor in respect to the doctrine which he may have entertained concerning the causal nexus between man's sensuous nature (corporeity) and sin.—**The foundation of which is in the dust**; *viz.:* of the houses of clay, for it is to these that the suffix points in אֲשֶׁר יְסוֹדָם; comp. Gen. iii. 19.—**Which are crushed as though they were moths.**—The suffix in יְדַכְּאוּם again refers back to the "houses of clay," only that here those who dwell in them, men, are included with them in one notion. The subj. of ידכאום is indefinite; it embraces "everything that operates destructively on the life of man." לִפְנֵי־עָשׁ, not "sooner than the moth is destroyed" (Hahn), nor: "sooner than that which is devoured by the moth" (Kamphsn.), nor: "more rapidly than a moth destroys" (Oehler, Fries), nor: "set before the moth [or 'worm,' after Jarchi] to be crushed" (Schlottmann), but: "like moths, as though they were moths" (LXX: *σητὸς τρόπον*). לִפְנֵי accordingly means the same here as in ch. iii. 24, and the *tertium comparationis* is the moth's frailty and powerlessness to resist, and not its agency in slowly but surely destroying and corroding, to which allusion is made in Hos. v. 12; Is. l. 9; li. 8; also below in ch. xiii. 28 of our book [To the latter idea the verb דִּכָּא used here is altogether unsuited, the meaning being to crush, not to consume in the manner of the moth.]

Ver. 20. **From morning to evening are they destroyed**; *i. e.*, in so short a space of time as the interval between morning and evening they can be destroyed, one can destroy them (יֻכַּתּוּ, potential and impersonal, like ידכאום in ver. 19). For the use of this phrase, "from morning till evening," as equivalent to "in the shortest time," comp. Is. xxxviii. 12; also our proverbial saying: "well at morning, dead at night," as well as the name "day-fly" [comp. "day-lily," "ephemeron."]—**Before any one marks it they perish forever.**—מִבְּלִי מֵשִׂים, scil. לֵב (comp. ch. i. 8; xxiii. 6; xxiv. 12), "without there being any one who gives heed to it, who regards it," and hence the same as "unobserved, unawares;" not "in folly," "without understanding" (Ewald).

Ver. 21. **Is it not so:—if their cord in them is torn away, they die, and not in wisdom?**—The construction is the same as in ver. 2; the words נסע יתרם בם are an elliptical conditional clause, intercalated in the principal interrogative sentence. יִתְרָם (which Olshausen needlessly proposes to amend to יְתֵדָם, "their tent-pin"), is neither "their residue" (Vulgate, Rabb., Luther, *etc.*); nor "their best, their chief excellence" (De Wette, Amheim, Schlottmann [Davidson, Barnes, Noyes, E. V.], *etc.*); nor their bow-string ("the string which is drawn out in them as in a bow," and which is unloosed to make the bow useless; Umbreit); [nor "their abundance, excess, whether of wealth or tyranny," and which passes away with them (Lee), which does not suit the *universality* of the description; nor "their fluttering round is over with them" (Good, Wemyss; taking הלא as a verb, "to pass away," and נסע as a noun, "fluttering;" two forced interpretations)—E.]; but—the only interpretation with which the verb נִסַּע, "to be torn away," agrees (comp. Judges xvi. 3, 14; Is. xxxiii. 20)—"their tent-cord," the thread of their life, here conceived as a cord stretched out and holding up the tent of the body; comp ch. xxx. 11; Is xxxviii. 12; also ch. vi. 9; xxvii. 8; and especially Eccles. xii. 6, where this inward hidden thread of life is represented as the silver cord, which holds up the lamp suspended from the tent-canvass (see comment on the passage). This, the only correct construction of the passage (according to which יֶתֶר=מֵיתָר, tent-cord), is adopted by J. D. Michaelis, Hirzel, Hahn, Delitzsch, Kamphsn., Dillmann [Wordsworth, Renan, Rodwell, Gesenius, Fürst]. ["בָּם is neither superfluous nor awkward (against Olsh.), since it is intended to say that their duration of life falls in all at once like a tent when that which *in them* corresponds to the cord of a tent (*i. e.*, the נֶפֶשׁ) is drawn away from it." Del.]—**And not in wisdom**; without having found true wisdom during their life, living in short-sightedness and folly to the end of their days; comp. xxxvi. 12; Prov. x. 21 (Dillmann).

b. Third Double Strophe. Application of the contents of the heavenly revelation to Job's case, ch. v. 1-7.

First Strophe. Vers. 1-5. [The folly of murmuring against God asserted and illustrated].

Ver. 1. **Call now! is there any one who will answer thee? and to whom of the holy ones wilt thou turn?**—That is to say: forasmuch as, according to the interpretation

of that Voice from God in the night, neither men nor angels are just and pure before God, all thy complaining against God will be of no avail to thee; not one of the heavenly servants of God in heaven, to whom thou mightest turn thyself, will regard thy cry for help, not one of them will intercede with God for thee, and spare thee the necessity of humbling thyself unconditionally and penitently beneath the chastening hand of God. [The question is somewhat ironical in its tone. If thou art disposed to challenge God's dealings with thee, make the attempt; enter thy protest; but before whom? the angels, the holy ones of heaven? Behold they are not pure before God, and being holy, they are conscious of their inferiority; will they entertain thy appeal? Where then is thy plea to find a hearing? "Here as elsewhere in this book, *call* and *answer* seem to be law terms, the former denoting the action of the complainant, the latter that of the defendant." NOYES; and so Umbreit.—E.] קְדֹשִׁים, "holy ones" ["saints," E. V., is misleading, on account of its association with "the holy" among men], here for angels (as in ch. xv. 15; Ps. lxxxix. 6 (5), 8 (7); Dan. iv. 14 (17); Zach. xiv. 5); thus called with a purpose, because their very holiness, which causes them to subordinate themselves unconditionally to God (comp. ch. iv. 18), prevents them from entertaining such complaints as those of Job. "How little the Roman Catholic commentators are justified in finding in this verse a *locus classicus* in favor of the invocation of angels and saints under the Old Dispensation needs no proof." SCHLOTT.]

Ver. 2. **For grief slayeth a fool.**—כִּי furnishes a reason for the negative thought contained in the preceding verse [complaints against God's administration will meet with no favorable response from the holy ones of his court, *for* they are of a character to destroy the fool who utters them—E.]; hence it may be properly rendered "rather" [so far from calling forth sympathy, they will much rather destroy the complainer—E.]; comp. ch. xxii. 2; xxxi. 18. The ל before אֱוִיל is after the Aramaic usage, introducing the object which is emphatically placed first: *quod attinet ad stultum* ["as for the fool"], *etc.;* so also in ch. xxi. 22; Isa. xi. 9 (comp. Ewald, § 292, e; 310, a). [Denied by Hengstenberg, who explains it as a poetic modification of the sense of the verb: *stulto mortem affert*, but favored by the position and the accounts.—E.] The אֱוִיל here is naturally one who impatiently murmurs against God because of his destiny, and presumptuously censures Him; such a one as Job must have seemed to Eliphaz to be in view of his lamentations and curses in ch. iii. As synonymous with אֱוִיל we have in the second member פֹּתֶה, "the simple one, without understanding" ["open to evil influences, a moral weakling." DAV.], while to כַּעַשׂ, "grief"[=unmanly repining] in the first member, we find to correspond in the second קִנְאָה, properly "zeal," here in the bad sense, insolent murmuring, a rancorous feeling toward God. For the form כעשׂ [peculiar to Job], instead of the usual form, כעס, comp. ch. vi. 2; x. 17. [Some (*e. g.* Barnes) refer כעשׂ and קנאה here to the "wrath" and "jealousy" of God against the sinner. But "it is certainly better to apply the words here to the emotions of the fool; his own passion and jealousy ruin him. (1) We have then the proper autonemesis of sin; its violence brings no help but only destruction to itself, which is the nerve of all Eliphaz is saying (vers. 6, 7). (2) Job refers to these bitter words of Eliphaz with evident pain in the very opening of his reply (ch vi. 2): would God that my כַּעַשׂ were but weighed! (3) The words fit well Job's state of mind." DAV.]

Vers. 3-5. An example in proof of the statement just made about the destruction of him who murmurs against God.

Ver. 3. **I myself have seen a fool taking root**, to wit, like a thriving plant, growing in fruitful soil, and hence in a state of prosperity which promised to endure and to increase; compare Ps. i. 3; Is. xxvii. 6, *etc.*—**Then I cursed his habitation suddenly**, *i. e.*, when I perceived how altogether unstable and superficial was his prosperity, and what a fearful judgment all at once burst over his head by the decree of God. It is to the moment of the descent of this judgment that פִּתְאֹם refers, and נָקַב, "to curse," is not to be understood as a prophetic prediction of the ruin which is hereafter to overtake one in prosperity (Ewald, Schlottmann, *etc.*), but as a recognition accompanying the event, a subjective human echo, so to speak, of God's curse, which has already actually overtaken its object. ["The word 'suddenly' points as with the finger to the catastrophe by which at one stroke Job's prosperity was laid in the dust, to the Chaldeans and Sabeans, to the lightning and the storm." HENGST. "I cursed his habitation suddenly," means accordingly; when sudden destruction smote his habitation, I felt and declared that it was cursed of God.—E.] נָוֶה, habitation, abode ["homestead," Carey], including the pasture-land belonging to it, not simply the pasturage, or grazing-place of the herds. Comp. ch. v. 24; xviii. 15; also נָוָה, ch. viii. 6.

Ver. 4. **His sons were far from help, and were crushed in the gate without deliverance.**—The Presents (Imperfects) in this and the following verse, describe the consequences of the judgment on the fool as they extend into the present. יֶשַׁע, "help, deliverance," as in ver. 11. יִדַּכְּאוּ, Imperf. Hithp., lit.: "they must allow themselves to be crushed," *viz.:* by their unjust accusers and persecutors in the court of justice, before the tribunal; for it is to this that reference is made in בַשַּׁעַר; comp. ch. xxix. 7; xxxi. 21; also the same exact form of expression, excepting the Piel instead of the Hithp. in Prov. xxii. 22: "oppress not the poor in the gate." See Com. *in loco*. [Davidson and Rodwell take the verb in the reflex sense: "And crushed each other in the gate." On the uses of the "gate" of an oriental city, see Smith's Bib. Dict., art. "Gate."]

Ver. 5. **He whose harvest the hungry devour.**—אֲשֶׁר, not a conjunction, "because,'

or "while" (Delitzsch), but a relative pronoun, "whose;" comp. ch. xx. 22; xxxi. 8. The description of the judgment, begun in the preceding verse, is here accordingly continued, with special reference to the property of him who is cast down from the height of his prosperity.—**And take it away even out of a thorn-hedge**, *i. e.*, they are not kept off even by hedges of thorn, hence they carry on their plundering in the most daring and systematic manner. אֶל before מִצִּנִּים is here the same as עַד: *adeo e spinis* (comp. ch. iii. 22) [and see Ewald, § 219, c.]—**And the thirsty swallow up his wealth** [lit.: "their wealth;" the plural suffix indicating that the children are here included]. Instead of צַמִּים, it is better, following out the hint which lies in רָעֵב in the first member, as well as following the lead of almost all the ancient versions, to read צְמֵיִם, or צְמֵאִים, perhaps even the singular צָמֵא. So Rosenm., Umbreit, Ewald [who in his Gram., § 73, c. suggests that the omission of the א may be due to its location between two vowel sounds], Hirzel, Vaihinger, Stickel, Welte, Ezra [Dillmann, Renan, Wordsworth, Barnes, Elzas, Merx], *etc.* To this subject, moreover, the verb שָׁאַף is best suited, which signifies to snap, greedily to drain, to lap, or sip up anything [Ges. and Fürst: to pant; Renan: to look on with longing, *couve des yeux ses richesses*]. According to the Masoretic text, צַמִּים, the translation should be: "and *a snare* catches their wealth" [Dav. and Con.: "a snare gapeth for their substance"]. צַמִּים, from צמם, *nectere*=snare, gin, might indeed be used here tropically for fraud, robbery (not, however, for "robbers," as the Targ. and some of the Rabbis [also E. V., sing. "robber"] take it, nor for "intriguer," as Delitzsch [Carey, Wemyss] have it). [The meaning "snare" is adopted by Ges., Fürst, Noyes, Con., Dav., Schlottm., Hengsten.] This rendering, however, would be rather harsh, especially in connection with the verb שָׁאַף, which favors rather the interpretation we have given above.

Second Strophe. Vers. 6, 7. [Human suffering founded on a Divine ordinance].

Ver. 6. **For evil goes not forth from the dust, and trouble does not sprout up out of the ground**; *i. e.*, the misfortune of men does not grow like weeds out of the earth; it is no mere product of nature, no accidental physical and external ingredient of this earthly life; but it has its sufficient cause, it originates in human sin; God decrees and ordains it for the punishment of sin; whence it follows that the proper remedy against it is the renunciation of sin, and not a gloomy frowardness and mournfulness. אָוֶן and עָמָל precisely as in ch. iv. 8.

Ver. 7. **But** [כִּי adversative, and so Schlott., Dillm., Dav., Del., Ren., Hengst., *etc.*] **man is born to trouble**; *i. e.*, it lies in human nature, through sin to bring forth misery (Hirzel, Dillmann, *etc.*); as man he is now not pure, but impure, not righteous, but unrighteous (comp. ch. iv. 17), and for that very reason he cannot avoid manifold suffering and hardship, the divinely ordained consequence of sin. Observe how gently Eliphaz seeks to bring home to Job the truth that *his* suffering is also the consequence of his sin. [יוּלָּד is by some regarded as Pual Perf., the short shureq written with Vav (Green, Gr., § 43, b); by others as Hoph. Imperf. (Ewald, § 131, c.); while others would point it יִוָּלֵד, as Niph. Imperf. (Merx)].—**As the sparks of the flame fly upward**; lit.: "*and* the sparks," *etc.* ו *comparationis*, as in Prov. xxv.-xxix. often; comp. Job xxii. 11; xiv. 12, 19 [otherwise also called Vav *adæquationis;* see Green, Gr. § 287, 1]. בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף, "sons of the fire, children of the flame" (comp. Cant. viii. 6), are naturally neither "birds of prey" (*νεοσσοὶ γυπῶν*, LXX.; comp. the *aves* of the Vulg. So also J. D. Michaelis, Gesenius [Fürst], Vaihinger, Heiligstedt [Umbreit, Good, Wemyss, Conant, Noyes, Renan, Rodwell], *etc.;* nor "angels" (Schlottmann, who refers to Judg. xiii. 20; Ps. civ. 4); nor "angry passions" (Böttcher, and similarly Stickel); but simply "fire-sparks" (Ewald, Hirzel, Hahn, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Dillmann [Wemyss, Conant, Davidson, Barnes, Carey, Merx]). Only of these can it be properly said that they fly upwards by a law of necessity, which constitutes here the *tertium comparationis.* יַגְבִּיהוּ עוּף, lit.: "they make high their flight," they fly far up on high, fly unceasingly upwards (עוּף for לָעוּף, Ewald, § 285, a.) [It has been objected to the rendering "sparks" that the expression "make high their flight" is too strong to be applied to them, being more suitable to the lofty soaring of "birds," or "angels," or "arrows." But an appeal may confidently be taken on this point to the poetic sensibility of the reader who has ever watched the upward flight of sparks by night, when relative altitudes are but vaguely determined, and when these "sons of the flame" seem literally to soar and vanish among the stars.—E.]

[The central thought of the above strophe is that the connection between sin and suffering is a Divine ordinance. In vers. 1, 2 this is presented in the way of warning to Job as a truth against which he can take no appeal to any higher court, and as one of which he is in danger of realizing in his own case the extreme consequences; for the special sin of murmuring against God would infallibly bring about his ruin. In vers. 3-5 the same truth is vividly enforced by an illustration drawn from actual life. In vers. 6, 7 it is presented in the form of a general law, which, in the statement here given of it is a binary law, consisting of two parts, or propositions, which are complementary of each other; the first (ver. 6), negative, the second (ver. 7), positive. The misery which follows sin in general, and in particular the special example of misery following sin mentioned in vers. 3-5 is a DIVINE ORDINANCE: *because* (כִּי, ver. 6) evil is not from without, not from the earth, not from the material constitution of things, *for* (כִּי, ver. 7) MAN (אדם emphatic by position) is the cause of his own trouble, being *born* to it, a sufferer by an *internal*, not an external necessity, by a law of his own existence;

a law as *necessary*, too, as that which compels the sparks to fly upward. According to this view of the connection the כִּי in ver. 7 is argumentative as well as that in ver. 6. The source of misery is not without, *for* MAN himself is the source of it. As regards the tense of יולד it follows that if Imperf. (Niph., or more probably Hoph.) the two propositions are co-ordinated in time; evil is not wont to spring from the earth, for man is wont to be born to trouble. If Perf. (Pual), which seems preferable, the internal necessity of suffering in man himself is conceived as logically antecedent to the relation of man to the external world. His afflictions came not from without, for he *was born* under a law which subjects him to it.

Elzas renders ver. 7 *a:* "For then man would be born to trouble." But this is to miss the point of ver. 6, which is to deny not the *natural* and *necessary* character of suffering (for that is implied in ver. 7), but the internality and materiality of its cause.—E.]

4. *Third Division.* Exhortation to repentance, as the only means whereby Job could be restored to the Divine favor, and to the enjoyment of his former prosperity, ch. v. 8-27.

a. Fourth Double Strophe. Job should trustfully turn to God, the helper in every time of need, and the righteous Judge, vers. 8-16.

First Strophe. [Job encouraged to turn trustfully to God by a description of the beneficent operations of God in nature and among men], vers. 8-11.

Ver. 8. **Nevertheless I—I would turn to God.**—["Now comes a new turn in this magnificent discourse of Eliphaz—the hortatory part. . . . . El. for the first time fully conceives as a whole Job's attitude. Job's complaints and murmurs against God terrify and distress him, and with the recoil and emotion of horror he cries: But I would have recourse unto God! . . . The antithetic transition here is as strong as possible, being made by three elements, the particle of opposition (אוּלָם, ch. i. 11; ii. 5), the addition by the pronoun *I*, and these two intensified and made to stand out with solemn emphasis in utterance, by being loaded with distinctive accents." DAV.] For the conditional sense of אֶדְרֹשׁ, comp. Ges. § 127 [Conant's Ed., § 125], 5 [Green, Gr. § 263, 1]. דָּרַשׁ with אֶל, *sedulo adire aliquem*, to turn to any one with entreaty, supplicating help; comp. Deut. xii. 5: also ch. viii. 5 of our book.—**To the Most High would I commit my cause.**—As in the preceding part of the verse God is called אֵל (the strong, the mighty one), as here He is called אֱלֹהִים, for the first time by Eliphaz. In regard to the significance of this change, comp. Del.: "אֵל is God as the mighty one; אֱלֹהִים is God in the totality of His variously manifested nature." דִּבְרָה, *causa*, plea, as elsewhere דָּבָר (comp. on ch. iii. 4).

Vers. 9-11. A description of the wondrous greatness of God, as a ground of encouragement for the exhortation contained in ver. 8.

Ver. 9. **Who doeth great things which are unsearchable.**—["El.'s object is now to present God under such aspects as to win Job, and his description of Him is Infinite power directed by Infinite goodness." DAV.] וְאֵין חֵקֶר in which there is no searching, *i. e.*, which are not to be searched out; comp. וְאֵין מַצִּיל, ver. 4.

Ver. 10. **Who giveth rain on the face of the land [and sendeth water on the face of the fields].**—חוּץ, lit.; all that is without, the open air [colloquial English: "out of doors"], in contrast with that which is covered, enclosed. Hence it means either a street, court, market-place, when the stand-point of the speaker is within a house, or the open country, field, plain, when the stand-point is within a city or a camp. The latter is the case here, as also in ch. xviii. 17. [According to Ges. (Lex. 1, b) the contrast between ארץ and חוצות is that of "tilled land" and "the deserts." To this Conant makes two valid objections: "(1) There is nothing to indicate such a limitation of ארץ (*tilled* land); (2) the distinctive meaning of חוצות is obscured." Hence it is best to take ארץ generally, of the earth at large, חוצות in a more limited sense, "the fields."] The agency of rain-showers and of spring-water (מַיִם, comp. Ps. civ. 10) in making the earth fruitful is an image of frequent occurrence with Oriental writers in general, and with the writers of Scripture in particular, to illustrate the wonderful exercise of God's power and grace in helping, delivering, and restoring life; comp. Ps. lxv. 10 seq.; cxlvii. 9 seq.; Jer. xiv. 22, as also the more comprehensive description in Jehovah's discourse, ch. xxxviii. 25. ["He who makes the barren places fruitful can also change suffering into joy." DEL.]

Ver. 11. **To set the low in a high place, and the mourning raise up to prosperity.**—This being the moral purpose of those mighty beneficent activities of God; comp. Ps. lxxiv. 15; Luke i. 52, *etc.* לָשׂוּם is not simply a variation for הַשָּׂם, as the LXX., Vulg, and several modern commentators, *e. g.*, Heiligstedt, Del. [Con.], explain; at the same time it does not need to be resolved (as by Ewald and Hahn) into: "inasmuch as he sets;" it is simply declarative of purpose, like the examples of the telic infinitive several times occurring in the Hebraistic Greek of Zacharias's song of praise, Luke i. 72, 73, 77, 79 (*τοῦ δοῦναι, τοῦ κατευθῦναι, etc.*) ["The issue of all the Divine proceeding in nature, unsearchable, uncountable though its wonders were, was ever to elevate the humble and save the wretched." DAV.] In the second member this infinitive construction with לְ is continued by the Perf. precisely as in ch. xxviii. 25 (Dillmann ["Because the purpose is not merely one that is to be realized, but one that has often been realized already, the Inf. is continued in the Perf." DILLM.], comp. Ewald, § 346 b.) "To set in a high place," to exalt to a high position, as in 1 Sam. ii. 8; Luke i. 52. קֹדְרִים, lit.: "dirty," *squalidi, sordidi, i. e.*, mourners; comp. ch. xxx. 28; Ps. xxxv. 14 [13]; xxxviii. 7 [6]. שָׂגְבוּ יֶשַׁע, lit., to mount,

or climb up to prosperity, a bold poetic construction of a verb in itself intransitive with an accusative of motion.

Second Strophe. Vers. 12-16. Continuation of the description of the exalted activity of God as a helper of the needy, and a righteous avenger.

Ver. 12. **Who brings to nought the devices of the crafty.**—מֵפֵר (Partic. without the art., as in ver. 9), lit., who breaks to pieces, עֲרוּמִים, as in ch. xv. 5, "the crafty, cunning, twisted" (from ערם, "to twist, to wind").—**So that their hands cannot do the thing to be accomplished.**—וְלֹא, "so that not" (comp. Ewald, § 345, a.). [תַּעֲשֶׂנָה, with vowel written defectively in the tone-syllable. Comp. Ewald, § 198, a; and Ges., § 74, Kal., Rem. 6]. תּוּשִׁיָּה, lit., essentiality, subsistence, firmness (from יֵשׁ), hence the opposite of אָוֶן, well-being and wisdom in one; a favorite notion of the authors of the Old Testament Chokmah-Literature; comp. my Com. on Proverbs, Introd., p. 5, also on ch. ii. 7 (p. 54). As may be seen from the translation of the Sept., which is essentially correct, *οὐ μὴ ποιήσουσιν ἀληθές*, the passage may be translated: "so that their hands shall bring about nothing real, nothing solid" (comp. Hahn, Delitzsch, Dillmann [Carey, Merx]).

Ver. 13. **Who captures the wise in their craftiness.**—חֲכָמִים denotes here those who are wise in a purely worldly sense, who are wise only in their own and in others' estimation, who are therefore *σοφοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, 1 Cor. i. 20; comp. ch. iii. 19, where the idea conveyed by the expression *σοφία τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* is explained by a special reference to the passage under consideration. The translation of the passage there presented is more correct than that of the LXX., especially in the rendering of בְּעָרְמָם by *ἐν πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν*. For עָרְמָה (comp. Ex. xxi. 24; Prov. i. 4; viii. 5), or even the masculine form עֹרֶם, which is found indeed only in the passage before us, unmistakably signifies "cunning, shrewdness," in the bad sense, not simply "sagacity" (*φρόνησις*, LXX.) ["'He captures them in their craftiness' means according to most: 'He brings it to pass, that the plans, which they have devised for the ruin of others, result in ruin to themselves.' So Grotius: *suis eos retibus capit, suis jugulat gladiis.* According to this view ב is ב of the instrument. Better, however, is: in their craft, or in the exercise of their craftiness. He captures the wise not when their wisdom has forsaken them, and they make a false step, but at the very point where they make the highest use of it." Hengst.]—**And the counsel of the cunning is overset**; lit., is precipitated, pushed over (נִמְהָרָה, 3 Perf. Niph.), and so made void, to wit, by God's judicial intervention.

Ver. 14. **By day they run against darkness, and as in the night they grope at noonday.** — [יְפַגְּשׁוּ־חֹשֶׁךְ, they strike upon, stumble on, run into, *i. e.*, they encounter darkness]. כַּלַּיְלָה, "as in the night, *i. e.*, as though it were night. Similar descriptions of a blindness, judicially inflicted by God, of an obscuration of the soul in ungodly men may be seen in ch. xii. 24 seq.; Is. xix. 13 seq.; lix. 10; Deut. xxviii. 29 (comp. the typical fundamental passage in Gen. xix. 11; also 2 Kings vi. 18; Wisd. xix. 16).

Ver. 15. **And so He saveth the needy from the sword out of their mouth, and from the hand of the strong.**—וַיֹּשַׁע, Imperf. consec., as in ch. iii. 21. ["Vav consec. introducing the ultimate residuum of all this commotion and confusion, the result of the whole combined Divine efficiency, when the Divine tendency . . . has reached its object; *so* He saves." Dav.] מֵחֶרֶב מִפִּיהֶם (instead of which some MSS. read: מֵחֶרֶב פִּיהֶם, "from the sword of their mouth") is equivalent to: "from the sword which goes forth out of their mouth;" comp. Ps. lvii. 5 (4); lix. 8 (7); lxiv. 4 (3); and other passages in which swords, or spears, or arrows of the mouth appear as a figurative expression for maliciously wicked slanders or injurious assaults on the good name of others [and comp. ver. 21 below, showing that Eliphaz regards this as one of the evils most to be dreaded. The explanation here given is adopted by Umbreit, Delitzsch, Hengstenberg, Merx, Renan, Bernard, Barnes, Wordsworth, Noyes, Rodwell, although there is some variation in regard to the relation of the two expressions; some taking the second in apposition to the first, "from the sword, even from their mouth," others, like Zöckler, regarding the second as qualifying the first: "the sword which goeth out of their mouth." Others view the second as explanatory of the first, which is taken as the leading term: "from the sword, which is their mouth, . . which is their organ of devouring, is to them what his mouth is to a wild beast," Davidson, and so substantially Schlottmann and Lee. Others, *e. g.*, Hirzel, take "sword," "mouth," "hand," as three independent terms, designating the instruments and organs of the wicked.—E.] In addition to the violation of the ninth commandment referred to in the first member, the second member of the verse mentions acts of violent oppression, or assaults on the liberty and life of men, violations, therefore, of the sixth commandment, as that from which God would deliver. The מִן before חֶרֶב seems to be superfluous, and producing as it does a harsh construction, it has led to various attempts at emendation, *e. g.*, מָחֳרָב, "desolated, ravaged by misfortune" (L. Capellus, Ewald [Good, Carey, Conant, Elzas and Dillmann favorably inclined. Delitzsch argues against it that it is "un-Hebraic according to our present knowledge of the usage of the language, for the passives of חרב are used of cities, countries, and peoples, but not of individual men"]). Others would read חֶרֶב instead of מֵחֶרֶב (so some MSS.; also the Targ. and Vulg.). These suggestions, however, are unnecessary; and the same may be said of Böttcher's explanation: "without a sword," *i. e.*, without violence or bloodshed [will God save].

Ver. 16. **Thus there is hope** (again) **to the poor** [דַּל from דלל, to hang down, and so to be

lax, languid, feeble, according to Gesenius: to wave, to totter, and so to be tottering loose, wretched, according to Fürst], **but iniquity shuts her mouth.**—For the absolute construction of "hope," to wit, to hope for deliverance and exaltation through God's assisting power and grace, comp. ch. xiv. 7; xix. 10. In regard to the etymology of תִּקְוָה, the standard word for hope in the Old Testament, comp. my Dissert.: *De vi ac notione voc. ἐλπίς in N. To.* (1856), p. 5 seq.—עֹלָתָה, the full-toned form, with double fem. ending, for עֹלָה, which also stands for עַוְלָה (Ps. xcii. 16). Comp. Ewald, § 173 g. [also § 186, c., Ges., § 79, f., Green, § 61, 6, a.] For the phrase קָפַץ פֶּה, to be dumb, *i. e.*, to be ashamed, to own oneself vanquished, comp. the repetition of the present passage in Ps. cvii. 42; also Is. lii. 15, and Job xxi. 5.

[SCHLOTTMANN: "The beginning of this strophe: 'But I would turn to God,' is again in appearance courteous, friendly, mild. But even here we see lurking in the background that self-sufficient hardness of Eliphaz which has already been noticed. Baldly and sharply expressed the relation of this strophe to the one which precedes and the one which follows is this: Third Strophe—Thy way is wrong; Fourth Strophe—My way is right; Fifth Strophe—It will be well for thee if thou followest me."]

b. Fifth Double Strophe. Job will have occasion to regard his present suffering as a blessing, if, being accepted as wholesome chastisement, it should result in his repentance, and thus in the restoration even of his external prosperity, vers. 17-27.

First Strophe. Vers. 17-21. [The happy results of submission to the Divine chastisement, principally on the negative side, as restoration and immunity from evil].

Ver. 17. **Lo, happy the man whom God correcteth.**—The same thought expressed, and derived perhaps from this passage, in Prov. iii. 11 seq. (Heb. xii. 5 seq.), and Ps. xciv. 12. Comp. Elihu's further expansion of the same thought of the wholesomeness of the Divine chastisements in ch. xxxiii. and seq. הוֹכִיחַ, to reprove, admonish, to wit, through the discipline of actual events, through suffering and providential dispensations: comp. ch. xiii. 10—**Therefore despise not the chastening of the Almighty,** of which one may be guilty by perverse moroseness and rebelliousness, by refusing to accept the needed and salutary teaching of the Divine dispensation, and in general by a want of submission to God's will. שַׁדַּי by poetic abbreviation for אֵל שַׁדַּי, Gen. xvii. 1. Comp. the remarks of the editor on the passage.

Ver. 18. **For He woundeth and also bindeth up,** *etc.*—Comp. the similar passages in Hos. vi. 1; Deut. xxxii. 39; Lam. iii. 31 seq. —הוּא he, *i. e.*, one and the same The form תִּרְפֶּינָה is made as though it were derived from a verb, רפא=רפה; comp. Ges., § 75 [§ 74], Rem. 21 c. [Green, § 165, 3].

Ver. 19. **In six troubles He will deliver thee, and in seven no evil shall befall thee**; *i. e.*, of course provided thou wilt really be made better by thy chastisement. The further promises of Divine help, ver. 20 seq., are also subject to the same condition. To the number six seven is added in order to remove the definiteness of the former, and to make prominent only the general idea of multiplicity. Similar enumerative forms of expression are to be found in Amos i and ii.; also in Prov. vi. 16; xxx. 15, 18, 21; comp. also Mic. v. 5; Eccles. xi. 2.

Ver. 20. **In famine He redeems thee from death.**—פָּדְךָ, lit., "he has redeemed thee." Perf. of certainty (Gesen., § 126 [124], 4), which is immediately followed by verbs in the imperf., as in ch. xi. 20; xviii. 6, *etc.* In the second member, "out of the hands of the sword" (מִידֵי חֶרֶב) is equivalent to "out of the power of the sword," or "from its stroke" (Delitzsch). Compare Is. xlvii. 14; Jer. xviii. 21; Ps. lxiii. 11. ["The word 'hands' should not be left out. Poetry personifies everything, invests everything with form and life As here 'hands' are attributed to the sword, so elsewhere are a mouth, Ex. xvii. 3, a face, Lev. xxvi. 37. Hands are in the Old Testament assigned to the grave, to lions, bears, to the dog, the snare, the flame." HENGSTENBERG].

Ver. 21. **In the scourging of the tongue thou art hidden**; *i. e.*, when thou art slandered and reviled (comp. ver. 15; Jer. xviii. 18; Ps. xxxi. 21 (20). Instead of מִשּׁוֹט, which we might certainly expect here (with Hirzel), the poet, anticipating the מִשּׁוֹד of the second member, which would resemble it altogether too much in sound, has written בְּשׁוֹט, "in the scourge," *i. e.*, "in the stroke of the scourge." [שׁוֹט might be taken as the Infinitive of the verb, as is done apparently by Ewald, who translates: "when the tongue scourges."—"The tongue is here compared with a scourge, as elsewhere with a knife, a sword, arrows, or burning coals (Ps. cxx. 4), because evil speaking hurts, wounds, and works harm." HENGST. "We believe that in introducing this expression the poet has a definite purpose. There lies a certain irony in the fact that Eliphaz should mention as one of the chief evils from which his friend is one day to be preserved that same calamity which he is now inflicting on him." SCHLOTT.]—**And thou fearest not destruction when it cometh.** —שׁוֹד, which in the following verse is written שֹׁד, a form etymologically more correct, from שׁדד, signifies any catastrophe, or devastation, whether by flood, or hail, or storm, *etc.* The word forms an assonance with שׁוֹט, as in Isaiah xxviii. 15, a passage which is perhaps an imitation of the one before us. Substantially the same thought is expressed in Ps. xxxii. 6.

Second Strophe. [The happy results of submission to chastisement still further described, principally on the positive side, as involving security, prosperity, peace, *etc.*]. Vers. 22-26 (ver. 27 being subjoined as a conclusion, standing properly outside of the strophe).

Ver. 22. **At destruction and at famine thou shalt laugh.**—["The promises of El.

now continue to rise higher, and sound more delightful and more glorious." Del.] A continuation of the description of the new state of happiness to which the sufferer will be promoted on condition of a contrite submission to the Divine chastisement. שָׂחַק with לְ, to laugh, or mock at anything, as in ch. xxxix. 7, 18; xli. 21.—כָּפָן, Aram. equivalent to רָעָב, famine, dearth; comp. ch. xxx. 3.—**And thou shalt not be afraid before the wild beasts of the land.** ["*Thou needest not be afraid*," אַל, different from לֹא (ver. 21), the latter is objective, merely stating a fact, the former subjective, throwing always over the clause the state of mind of the speaker as an explanation of it—expressing both the statement and the mental state of feeling or thought out of which the statement issued. As Ew. (Lehrb. 320, 1, a.) accurately puts it, 'אַל, like μή, denies only according to the feeling or thought of the speaker,' thou shalt have no reason to, needest not (Con.) fear." Dav.] Wild beasts were in ancient times the object of far graver terror in the east, and a scourge of far more frequent occurrence than to-day. Comp. Gen. xxxvii. 20, 33; xliv. 28; Lev. xxvi. 6; Prov. xxii. 13; xxvi. 13, *etc.*; also Ezekiel's well-known combination of the four judgments: the sword, famine, wild beasts, and the pestilence (Ezek. v. 17; xiv. 21).

Ver. 23. **For with the stones of the field thou hast a league, and the wild beasts of the field are become friends to thee.**—The first half of the verse is a reason for the first member of ver. 22; the second half in like manner a reason for the second member. "Thou hast a league with the stones of the field" (lit., "thy league is with the stones," *etc.*; בְּרִיתֶךָ equivalent to בְּרִית לְךָ), *i. e.*, storms cannot injure thy tillage of the soil, they shall be far removed from thy fields (comp. Is. v. 2; 2 Kings iii. 19, 25). ["The stones are personified; they conclude a treaty with the reformed Job, and promise not to injure him, not to be found straying over his tilled land." Hengst.] As regards the contents of the entire strophe, compare the similar ideal descriptions of the paradisaical harmony that is one day to exist between men and the animate and inanimate creation, Hos. ii. 20 [18], 23 [21] seq.; Is. xi. 6 seq. [The view, entertained among others by Barnes, that the verse describes security in travelling ("it is to be remembered that this was spoken in Arabia where rocks and stones abounded, and where travelling from that cause was difficult and dangerous"), is at variance with the picture here given, which is that of security and happiness in a settled, stationary condition; the picture of a prosperous proprietor of fields, pastures, flocks, not of a travelling Bedouin chief—E.]

Ver. 24. **And thou knowest** (findest out by experience) **that thy tent is peace.**—וְיָדַעְתָּ, Perf. consec. with the tone on the last syllable, connected with ver. 22. "Thy tent is peace," *i. e.*, the state of all thy possessions and household (comp. ch. viii. 22; xi. 14; xii. 6, and often) is one of peace.—שָׁלוֹם is predicate, emphatic by position (comp. Mic. v. 4, וְהָיָה זֶה שָׁלוֹם), and for that reason a substantive. It is weakening the beautiful, rounded, complete idea to take the word either as an adjective, or as an adverbial accusative in the sense of "well, safe, uninjured," as, *e. g.*, Ewald, Dillmann, and Hahn, *etc.*, do. [The same remark applies to the use of the preposition, "in peace," E. V., Con., *etc.* The simple rendering "is peace" is more forcible and expressive.—E.]—**And when thou reviewest thy estate thou missest nothing.**—נָוֶה as in ver. 3 [Zöckler: Stätte, "place," the habitation of himself and his flocks; by most, however, נָוֶה is taken here rather of the pasture of the flocks]. וְלֹא תֶחֱטָא, lit., "and thou wilt not miss thy way," *i. e.*, thou wilt miss nothing (Prov. viii. 36). At variance with the usage of the words, and against the connection, is Luther's translation: "and thou wilt care for thy household, and not sin," following the Vulg.: *et visitans speciem tuam non peccabis* [Eng. Ver.: "and thou shalt visit thy habitation, and shalt not sin." Hengstenberg, adopting this rendering, explains: in looking over thy possessions thou shalt find thou art not treated by God as a sinner, but as a friend, being richly blessed by Him; an explanation which involves a needless constraint of the expression.—E.] The thought is rather the same with that expressed in Schiller's fine lines:

> Er zählt die Häupter seiner Lieben,
> Und sieh, ihm fehlt kein theures Haupt.*

[In negative sentences, where the object of the verb is wanting, לֹא may be rendered "nothing." See Ewald, § 303, c.]

Ver. 25. . . . **And thine offspring as the green herb of the earth**—צֶאֱצָאִים, used here of the issue of the body, as in ch. xxi. 8; xxvii. 14. Comp. the like promise in Ps. lxxii. 16 *b*. [The word found only in Isaiah and Job].

Ver. 26. **Thou shalt go into the grave in a ripe old age.**—כֶּלַח, etymologically related to כלה, "to be full, to be completed" (to which it stands related as a variation, with a somewhat harsher pronunciation, just as קשח, in ch. xxxix. 16, stands related to קשה), signifies, according to the parallel expression בְּעִתּוֹ in the second member, the full ripeness of the life-period, the complete maturity of age. It is used somewhat differently in ch. xxx 2, where it denotes the full maturity of strength, complete unbroken vigor—a sense which Fleischer in Delitzsch (II. 138, n.) quite inappropriately assigns to it here also. [So Fürst. Merx gives the same sense to the passage, but reads כְּלֵחַ.—E.]—**As sheaves are gathered in their season.**—כַּעֲלוֹת גָּדִישׁ, lit., "as the heap of sheaves mounts up, is gathered up," to wit, into the threshing-floor, which was an elevated place; comp. 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; Ps. i. 4, *etc.* The rendering of Um-

* The heads he numbers of his darlings,
And, lo! no precious head is missed.

breit and Hahn: "as the sheaves are heaped up," is unsuitable, and at variance with the true meaning of the figure, as describing the ingathering of ripe sheaves. בְּעִתּוֹ, "in its season," *i. e.*, when the ears are fully ripened, a most striking simile to illustrate old age when satiated with life; comp. ch. xlii. 17; Gen. xv. 15; xxv. 8; xxxv. 39.

Ver. 27. **Lo, this we have searched out; so it is: hear it, and mark it well for thyself!**—A closing verse of warning, which, because it refers back to all that has been said by Eliphaz, stands outside of the last strophe. Comp. the similar short epiphonemas, or epimythions in ch. xviii. 21; xx. 29; xxvi. 14; also the short injunctions of the New Testament, enjoining men to mark and ponder that which is said, such as Matt. xi. 15; xiii. 9; Rev. ii. 7; xiii. 18; xxii. 2, *etc.* The Plur. חקרנוה, because Eliphaz speaks not in his own name alone, but also in that of his two friends, younger indeed than himself, but of whom he knows that their experience has been the same with his own.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The writer is certainly far from being disposed to put forth Eliphaz in the preceding discourse as an advocate of views which are decidedly untrue, and opposed to God, or as a propounder of diabolical wisdom (*σοφία ψυχική δαιμονιώδης*, Jas. iii. 15; comp. 1 Tim. iv. 1). If it had been his purpose to represent him as one who made common cause with Satan, as an *advocatus diaboli*, or the Evil One's armor-bearer, he would certainly have made some such sentiment as that of ch. ii. 9—"renounce God and die"—the fundamental theme of his remarks. But this tone of remark is limited to Job's wife (and the fact is strongly indicative of the attitude of an unregenerate woman, who simply follows the impressions of her own nature), who had lost alike her patience and resignation to the will of God. The poet does not introduce any one of Job's friends as sympathizing with it—least of all Eliphaz, whose superiority to the experimental stand-point of the other two friends, and to the entire circle of their ethical and intellectual insight, is so definitely and significantly apparent. Even in respect of its formal æsthetic structure he has impressed on the discourse the characteristics which mark it as the product of a genuine devout oriental sage, a *Chakam* of the same category with Solomon, Heman, Ethan, Chalcol, Darda, *etc.* This is shown by the numerous correspondences of expression between this discourse and the noblest products of the Old Testament Chokman-literature as elsewhere to be met with—correspondences which appear in part in the subject-matter, such as the emphasis laid on the fear of God and God's remedial discipline (ch. iv. 6; v. 8; v. 17) as fundamental conditions of true prosperity, the use of the term "fools" (ch. v. 2 seq.) in characterizing the wicked: in part in the language, as in the use of such expressions as חָכְמָה (ch. iv. 21), תּוּשִׁיָּה (ch. v. 12), or of such poetic forms as the numeral expressions in ch. v. 19, or of such figures and similes as sowing and reaping, taking root and growing, the soaring sparks, the "inward cord" (ch. v. 21), the sword of the mouth, and the scourge of the tongue, *etc.* In general it may be said that all that profound, physiological, or rather physico-theological Wisdom which forms the background of the discourse, and which accounts for the brilliant tints and fragrant aroma which are spread over the whole of it, evince the writer's purpose to represent the speaker as intellectually akin to Solomon, the student of nature among the sages (1 Kings iv. 29 seq.; v. 12), and as possessing a knowledge of God which if not accurate, such as belonged to the theocracy, was nevertheless truly monotheistic, such as belonged to the pious of the patriarchal world.

2. As regards *the theological contents* of this first discourse of Eliphaz, there is really scarcely anything to be pointed out in it which contradicts the true Old Testament religion of Jehovah, and the purity of the moral principles which rest on it.* A confessor of Eloah, of Shaddai, he speaks altogether like a member of the theocracy, like a pious man belonging to Jehovah's commonwealth. "*He is apparently right in everything;* and it is certainly with full, conscious purpose that the poet introduces him into the discussion with precisely such a discourse as the present; for only thus could a real entanglement arise with Job, and only thus could the attention of readers be secured for Job's opponents" (DILLM.) What Eliphaz holds up before Job, who, although indeed he does not blaspheme, does nevertheless utter imprecations, and, in a state of extreme dejection, curses himself, consists almost without exception of beautiful and profound religious and ethical truths, to which Job can successfully oppose only one thing—that they do not touch him, who is just as firmly convinced of their correctness as his opponents, that they cannot apply to his peculiar condition. So *e. g.* the position that God's sentence of destruction falls not on the innocent but only on the wicked: a general fundamental truth of religion, which is not only most strikingly confirmed by the issue of Job's own history, but is also often enough emphasized by him in his subsequent discourses, and is expressed in a manner altogether similar to what we find in so many of the holy songs of the Psalter, beginning with the first Psalm, the "Motto" of the entire collection. The same is no less true of the proposition concerning the universal sinfulness of all men, and indeed concerning the impurity even of the angels, when compared with the absolute holiness of God; a proposition which, presupposing, as it certainly does, the influences of a revolution from above (comp. ch. iv. 12 seq.), was the common property of all the pious and the wise of the Old Testament, and is one of the most conspicuous marks distinguishing the religious and moral knowledge, thought, and activity of those men from what is found in the heathen world.

* Comp. COCCEIUS: "The first discourse of Eliphaz, if you except the charge of impatience brought against Job (although that is stated mildly, and is not altogether without cause), and the offensive interpretation put on the words of Job, has in it nothing that is not holy, true, and excellent, and which is not most admirably adapted to strengthen patience," *etc.*

So again the affirmation of the necessity of disciplinary and purifying suffering for every man; the stern rebuke of the presumptuous discontent of him who will not submit to this rigid and yet loving, mild law of the Divine administration; the friendly counsel to the sorely tried Job to turn to God, and to take refuge only with Him (ch. v. 8 seq.); finally the promise that his happiness would be gloriously renewed if he should rightly improve his calamities, and derive from them the benefits properly connected with them, which again seems to indicate the complete harmony of the speaker's views with those of the poet, and to have a strictly prophetic relation to the final account of Job's restoration and glorious vindication in the Epilogue.

3. Notwithstanding this it is hardly correct to say with Delitzsch (I. 105) that "there is no doctrinal error to be discovered in the speech of Eliphaz." A certain *work-righteousness* may be found in it, notwithstanding the solemn emphasis with which it makes the universal sinfulness of all mankind the central point of the discussion. The way in which Job is exhorted, as in ch. iv. 6, to trust in his fear of God, and in the uprightness of his ways, and on account of the same to cherish hope in God, has doubtless something analogous in many expressions found in the Psalms (comp. Ps. xviii. 20 seq.; cxix. 168); but the connection of the passage, especially that which immediately follows, shows distinctly that the fundamental proposition—if pious, then prosperous; if unfortunate, then wicked—is here handled with a certain harsh one-sidedness and superficiality, which might easily develop into unjust judgments concerning the sorely tried sufferer, and in which accordingly was contained the germ of that difference which subsequently waxed more and more violent between the friends and Job. Still more doubtful than this tendency towards an external conception of the doctrine of retribution, a tendency which manifests itself but slightly and timidly, is the *absolute silence* of Eliphaz in respect to the possibility that Job's extraordinarily severe sufferings might nevertheless have another cause than particular sins of corresponding magnitude. Herein he shows his ignorance in regard to those deeper spiritual perceptions and experiences, by virtue of which pious persons, even before the coming of Christ, were able to recognize, in addition to the suffering inflicted for chastisement, and to that inflicted for purification, a suffering inflicted simply to try men. Such suffering they recognized as possible, and as sometimes decreed by God in His wisdom, as is sufficiently evident from such passages as Deut. viii. 2, 16; Prov. xvii. 3; Ps. lxvi. 10; Jer. vi. 27 seq.; Ezekiel xxii. 22; Zech. xiii. 9; also Sir. ii. 1 seq. (Of suffering borne as testimony, martyrdom, nothing needs to be said here, its necessity being first clearly recognized in the New Testament, after Christ had suffered on the cross). Finally, there lies a departure from the doctrine, which is clearly taught everywhere else in the Old Testament Revelation, in the statements of ch. v. 6, 7, where not only man's punishment for sin, but sinning itself is represented as something which attaches necessarily to human nature as such. In other words, it is here implied that *to be a man and to commit sin are two things which are by no means to be separated from each other*, being thus regarded, as in the doctrinal system of Schleiermacher and the majority of the critical rationalistic theologians of to-day as something that attaches to man's sensuous nature (see exeg. remarks on the passage).—From what has been said it follows that Eliphaz cannot indeed be regarded as a "Pelagian before Pelagius;" the poet has, however, unmistakably intended to set forth a certain theory of the holiness of works, and a legal narrowness in the circle of his ethical and religious perception, as lying at the foundation of his views. He has purposed to present him as a representative—one of the noblest, most thoughtful and profound indeed—but still a representative of the doctrine of external retribution, which was the popular opinion of antiquity before the coming of Christ, and has succeeded in expressing with a masterly skill which no one can question the fine shading by which that which is erroneous in his views, as compared with the profounder truth which afterwards comes gradually into prominence, is outlined forth. If we were to compare his Eliphaz with any ecclesiastical representative of one-sided theories, and more particularly of those in the department of anthropologic soteriology, which teach a legal righteousness of works, instead of turning our attention to Pelagius and Pelagianism, it would be decidedly more correct to think of such fathers as Jerome, the Gregories, Cassianus, *etc.* Especially does Jerome, the zealous champion of the proposition of universal sinfulness in opposition to Pelagius, who, however, had sunk almost as deeply as that heresiarch into an external self-righteousness and legality, give evident tokens of intellectual affinity with our sage. A point which, it would seem, would tend to lend special interest to any attempt to elaborate more fully the parallel between Eliphaz and Jerome, is the remarkable similarity which the description of the nocturnal spirit-vision (ch. iv. 12 seq.) with its emotional vividness and presentative power, bears to the celebrated "Anti-Ciceronian Vision" of Jerome in the Epistle to Eustachius (comp. my "Jerome," p. 45 seq.), a similarity which is more than simply external, or accidental, as the closely related ethical tendencies of both visions show.

4. That which injures the religious and moral value of the speech of Eliphaz more than all these weak and one-sided doctrinal features, which emerge into but slight prominence, and which would be scarcely noticed by an untrained eye, is a series of defects which lead us to infer in the speaker a defective character rather than an erroneous theory. The discourse, with all the beauty and truth of the greater part of its thoughts, is nevertheless "heartless, haughty, stiff and cold." It dwells self-complacently on general truths, known as well to Job and acknowledged by him, which are presented not without rhetorical pathos, but which are not brought into anything like a tenderly considerate, or profoundly apprehended relation to the special circumstances of him who is addressed. (1) It exhibits not a trace of genuine sympathy with the extraordinarily high measure of misery

which has overwhelmed the unhappy sufferer; instead of consoling him, it goes off into moralizing reflections, which bring him no comfort, which serve rather to embitter him. (2) It unqualifiedly identifies his complaint with that of a "fool," *i. e.*, of a man of abandoned wickedness and ungodliness (ch. v. 2 seq ; comp. ch. iv. 8 seq.), without the slightest effort to make a critical examination of the question, whether his essential character is not incomparably purer and more godly than that of a despairing blasphemer. (3) It assumes on his part hypocrisy, defective self knowledge, entanglement in a self-righteous delusion, and seeks to cure these defects by bringing forward that night-oracle, but by this very course he betrays a serious deficiency in knowledge of men, and in the power of a finer psychological observation. (4) It takes no account whatever of the great fact of the former purity of his life, and of his uncomplaining patience, and thus coarsely (not to say maliciously) makes no distinction between Job and the great mass of men. (5) Worst of all, it is not free from disingenuousness and deception; back of what it openly says, it suggests the existence of something worse yet, of which it regards Job as capable, if not as being already guilty, and thus deprives even that in it which seems adapted really to minister comfort, refreshment. and a wholesome stimulus (*e. g.*, the description in ch. v. 17 seq. of the blissful blossoming anew of the prosperity of him who repents and is reconciled with God), of its beneficent influence on the feelings of the sorely tempted sufferer. These indirect suggestions of certain defects in the disposition and character of Eliphaz (which, like those one-sided, doctrinal peculiarities, present a striking parallel with Jerome; comp. the work cited above, p. 332 seq., 391 seq.) are what—chiefly at least—according to the poet's purpose, furnish the occasion for further controversy, and incite Job to the comparatively passionate reply which he makes.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The homiletic expositor, especially if he treats the discourse of Eliphaz not as a unit, as the theme of *one* sermon, but only in detached passages (and it is scarcely possible that he should treat it otherwise), need not have the enjoyment, which its many glorious passages minister, marred by the manifold features which tend to quench and disturb it, and which indicate the one-sidedness of the stand-point occupied by the speaker. As opportunity offers it may be shown that Eliphaz is not a representative of the complete truth of Scripture, but is the champion of a party-doctrine, which later is expressly condemned by God as one-sided and erroneous; especially might it be indispensable to call attention to this in the passages found in ch. iv 6, and v. 6 seq , according to what has been said above (Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks, No. 3). But why it should be necessary to make anxious mention of the heterodoxy of the speaker in connection with all that Eliphaz says in harmony with all the other wise men of God under the Old Testament, all which does not contradict the *analogia fidei* of the Old Testament, and which immediately commends itself by its truth, beauty, and inward power—why this should be necessary is certainly not apparent. All requirements of this sort will be sufficiently satisfied if it be shown in the Introduction to the Sermon, or Meditation, that the text under consideration belongs to a discourse by a man who, as is evident from the fact that he is finally rebuked and censured by God, does not present the truth of Scripture in its fulness and entireness, but who none the less belongs to the class of divinely-enlightened sages and saints of the Old Testament, and whose utterances, in so far as they accord with those of other representatives of this class, such as Solomon, Asaph, the author of Ecclesiastes, *etc.*, must be recognized as equally important and valuable with those; nay, more, whose words, in so far as they express (if not directly, still indirectly) the poet's objective opinion, have the same right to be regarded as inspired as those of his counterpart, Job, who in truth falls often enough into one-sided views and grievous errors.

In a detached treatment of the text the Second Division (ch. iv. 12–v. 7) and the Third (ch. v. 7-26) stand forth as pericopes of some length, which are suitably defined as to their limits. In view of the richness of their contents, however, the division of both into smaller sections may be recommended, in which case it will be most natural, or indeed unavoidable, to be governed by the preceding division into strophes.—As respects the formal statement of themes and the more specific arrangement, the following remarks on *particular passages*, taken from the older homiletic treatments of the book, will supply suggestive hints:

Ch. IV. 2 seq. STARKE: A friend can indeed reprove another, if he has seen or heard anything wrong on his part (Sir. xx. 2); but he must not put the worst construction on everything. We should hear the admonitions and reproofs of our neighbor patiently, and take them for our improvement (Ps. cxli. 5).

Ch. IV. 7 seq. BRENTIUS: It is not so much absurd, as impious, for human reason to infer from afflictions that God is angry. Rather, as a father chastises his son whom he loves, and spares not the rod, so God crucifies those whom He elects together with His Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord. . . Eliphaz discourses truly, but he interprets the case according to his own carnal judgment of it; for the innocent, although they do not perish, are nevertheless afflicted; they are not destroyed, but they are oppressed.—HENGSTENBERG: The proposition which Eliphaz puts at the foundation of his argument: that true spiritual rectitude and complete destruction cannot accompany each other, is true. Instead, however, of taking for granted what he does in regard to Job, he ought to have done him the friendly service of controverting the assumption. He should have set out before him that often when the need is greatest, succor is nearest. He should have furnished him the right clue to his suffering by propounding the proposition: Whom God loveth He chasteneth. He was not, however, prepared to do this, as long as he, in common with Job, was wanting in the *right* perception of sin.

Ch. IV. 12 seq. ZEYSS: God taught the ancients His will by visions and dreams, and by such a revelation did for them that which He has since done by His word, written and preached (Gen. xxviii. 12; Num. xii. 6). He has revealed Himself thus even to the heathen (Gen. xx. 3). Hence they are without excuse (Rom. i. 20).—PASSAVANT (in his work on Vital Magnetism, 2d Ed., p. 131): In the dreams of a deep, sound sleep (comp. ver. 13) the soul seems to put forth a higher form of activity, and it may be that all significant dreams belong to this very condition, which seems furthest removed from the working consciousness.

Ch. IV. 17 seq. CRAMER: God has concluded all under sin, in order that He might have mercy upon all, that every mouth may be stopped, and the whole world be guilty before God, in order that by the works of the law no flesh should be justified in His sight (Rom. iii. 20).—WOHLFARTH: Erroneous as was the opinion of Eliphaz, that sinners only are punished here on account of their sins, no less true is the communication here made to him by a Divine revelation, that *no* man is pure before God, Gen. viii. 21; Ezek. iv. 18; Matt. xv. 19; 1 Cor. ii. 14, *etc.*

Ch. IV. 19 seq. BRENTIUS: This thought should be treasured up in the depth of our minds, in order that by it we may cast down the arrogance of our flesh. For why should you be proud of your noble lineage, your wealth, power, royal majesty? Consider, I pray you, what you were, what you are, and what you will be, and cease to stick up your crest; you were clay, you are a dung-hill, you will be corruption and the food of worms—why then should you boast (1 Cor. i. 31)?—CRAMER: Death sends no messenger, but when men least expect him, he enters all doors, even those of palaces (Jer. ix. 21; Luke xii. 20).

Ch. V. 3 seq. BRENTIUS: This passage teaches parents the fear of God, for who does not desire for his children everything that is best, and the most ample inheritance? Take care, therefore, to live piously, and to bring up your children in piety and in the admonition of the Lord. You cannot leave them a more ample patrimony than this; whereas if you live wickedly, and your children fill up the measure of the iniquity which they have derived from you, not only will you be cursed, but your children also will inherit their father's curse.

Ch. V. 6, 7. SEB. SCHMIDT: This remarkable passage contradicts the notion of man's free will in spiritual matters, and not only proves original sin, but also that by virtue of it there is no man who does not sin.—HENGSTENBERG: To sin is just as much a property of human nature as it is of sparks to fly upward. The doctrine of innate corruption, which rests on Gen. iii. 4 and v. 3 is already expressed here. (Is the statement here given of it, however, absolutely correct, and free from all one-sided admixture? Zöckler.—See above in the Critical and Doctrinal Remarks).

Ch. V. 8 seq. SEB. SCHMIDT: When we commend anything to God we do it by prayer, and hope or trust in God; so that although prayer is not expressly mentioned here, it is nevertheless implied in the words, and must not be neglected (1 Peter v. 7).

Ch. V. 10. STARKE: Although the rain has its own purely natural causes, we must still look up in connection with it to God, as the One who has so established nature, that the rain can fall, the sun shine, *etc.* (Jer. xiv. 22).

Ch. V. 17 seq. CRAMER: The dear cross [*das liebe Kreuz*, the affliction, adversity, whose uses are sweet] has great benefits connected with it (Rom. v. 3 seq.; James i. 2 seq.); we come by means of it to the knowledge of our sins (Ps. cxix. 67); we stop sinning (1 Peter iv. 1), we learn to give heed to the Word, and to pray diligently (Is. xxviii. 19), we become satiated with the world (Phil. i. 23), and are made conformable to the example of Christ (Rom. viii. 29).—Compare Fr. de la Motte. Fouqué's poem—"God's Chastisements" (especially 3d and 4th stanzas).

Ch. V. 19. BRENTIUS: The Lord delivers in six afflictions (*i. e.*, in every time of trouble), not by taking away the cross from our shoulders, but by ministering strength and patience to bear it. But in the seventh affliction (*i. e.*, when the season of trial is over) He gives deliverance both by taking away the cross, and by giving pure and unalloyed happiness (comp. 1 Cor. x. 13).—ZEYSS: There is no distress so great, so strange, so manifold, but God can deliver His people out of it (Ps. xci. 14 seq.; Is. xliii. 2; Dan. iii. 17; vi. 16, 22).

Ch. V. 20 seq. BRENTIUS: He enumerates the blessings of the godly man, who takes hold by faith of the Lord's hand. For the godly man, possessing the Lord by faith, remains perfectly serene in the face of all calamities, fearing neither famine, nor sword, nor rumors of war, nor desolation, nor the beasts of the earth. Yea, even though the heavens should fall, and the earth be wrecked, the ruins would smite him undismayed.—COCCEIUS: If any one should think that Eliphaz said these things in the spirit of prophecy about Job, as the type of Christ in obedience, afflictions, patience and exaltation, I should not be disposed to blame him. He who should maintain this would say that the present and the future are blended and treated as present; seeing them in the Spirit he depicts them as present.—For the limitation and partial correction of this typical and Messianic interpretation, comp. further Seb. Schmidt's remarks on the passage: "But who can believe that Eliphaz with all his recriminations against Job, would have prophesied good concerning him, nay, have made him even a type of Christ?" (The passage could thus be regarded only as *an involuntary prophecy*, like that of Balaam, or of Caiaphas).

B.—Job's Reply: Instead of Comfort, the Friends bring him only increased Sorrow.

CHAPTERS VI. 1—VII. 21.

1. Justification of his complaint by pointing out the greatness and incomprehensibleness of his suffering.

CHAPTER VI. 1-10.

1 But Job answered and said:

2 Oh that my grief were thoroughly weighed,
and my calamity laid in the balance together!
3 For now it would be heavier than the sand of the sea;
therefore my words are swallowed up.
4 For the arrows of the Almighty are within me,
the poison whereof drinketh up my spirit;
the terrors of God do set themselves in array against me.

5 Doth the wild ass bray when he hath grass?
or loweth the ox over his fodder?
6 Can that which is unsavory be eaten without salt?
or is there any taste in the white of an egg?
7 The things that my soul refuseth to touch
are as my sorrowful meat.

8 Oh that I might have my request,
and that God would grant me the thing that I long for!
9 Even that it would please God to destroy me;
that He would let loose His hand, and cut me off!
10 Then should I yet have comfort:
yea, I would harden myself in sorrow; let Him not spare;
for I have not concealed the words of the Holy One.

2. Complaint over the bitter disappointment which he had experienced at the hands of his friends.

VERS. 11-30.

11 What is my strength that I should hope?
and what is mine end that I should prolong my life?
12 Is my strength the strength of stones?
or is my flesh of brass?
13 Is not my help in me?
and is wisdom driven quite from me?

14 To him that is afflicted pity should be shewed from his friend;
but he forsaketh the fear of the Almighty.
15 My brethren have dealt deceitfully as a brook,
and as the stream of brooks they pass away;
16 which are blackish by reason of the ice,
and wherein the snow is hid.
17 What time they wax warm, they vanish;
when it is hot, they are consumed out of their place.

18 The paths of their way are turned aside;
they go to nothing, and perish.
19 The troops of Tema looked,
the companies of Sheba waited for them.
20 They were confounded because they had hoped;
they came thither and were ashamed.

21 For now ye are nothing;
ye see my casting down, and are afraid!
22 Did I say, Bring unto me?
or, Give a reward for me of your substance?
23 Or, Deliver me from the enemy's hand?
or, Redeem me from the hand of the mighty?

24 Teach me, and I will hold my tongue;
and cause me to understand wherein I have erred.
25 How forcible are right words!
but what doth your arguing reprove?
26 Do ye imagine to reprove words,
and the speeches of one that is desperate, which are as wind?
27 Yea, ye overwhelm the fatherless,
and ye dig a pit for your friend.

28 Now therefore be content, look upon me;
for it is evident unto you if I lie.
29 Return, I pray you, let it not be iniquity;
yea, return again, my righteousness is in it.
30 Is there iniquity in my tongue?
cannot my taste discern perverse things?

3. Recurrence to his former complaint on account of his lot, and accusation of God.

CHAPTER VII. 1-21.

1 Is there not an appointed time to man upon earth?
are not his days also like the days of an hireling?
2 As a servant earnestly desireth the shadow,
and as an hireling looketh for the reward of his work;
3 So am I made to possess months of vanity,
and wearisome nights are appointed to me.
4 When I lie down, I say,
When shall I arise and the night be gone?
and I am full of tossings to and fro unto the dawning of the day.
5 My flesh is clothed with worms, and clods of dust;
my skin is broken, and become loathsome.
6 My days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle,
and are spent without hope.

7 O remember that my life is wind!
mine eye shall no more see good.
8 The eye of him that hath seen me shall see me no more;
Thine eyes are upon me, and I am not.
9 As the cloud is consumed, and vanisheth away,
so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more.
10 He shall return no more to his house,
neither shall his place know him any more.
11 Therefore I will not refrain my mouth;
I will speak in the anguish of my spirit;
I will complain in the bitterness of my soul.

12 Am I a sea, or a whale,
that Thou settest a watch over me?
13 When I say, My bed shall comfort me,
my couch shall ease my complaint;
14 then Thou scarest me with dreams,
and terrifiest me through visions;
15 So that my soul chooseth strangling,
and death rather than my life.
16 I loathe it, I would not live alway;
let me alone; for my days are vanity.

17 What is man, that Thou shouldest magnify him?
and that Thou shouldest set Thine heart upon him?
18 And that Thou shouldest visit him every morning?
and try him every moment?
19 How long wilt Thou not depart from me,
nor let me alone till I swallow down my spittle?
20 I have sinned; what shall I do unto Thee, O Thou preserver of men?
why hast Thou set me as a mark against Thee,
so that I am a burden to myself?
21 And why dost Thou not pardon my transgression,
and take away mine iniquity?
for now shall I sleep in the dust;
and Thou shalt seek me in the morning, but I shall not be.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. This discourse of Job, the first formal reply which proceeded from him, attaches itself immediately to that which was one-sided, erroneous, and unjust in the discourse of Eliphaz (comp. above, page 327. It rebukes these defects, and justifies the complaints which Job had previously uttered in regard to his miserable condition, in part repeating with increased emphasis the reproaches which in his despair he had brought against God. The tone of his discourse however is so far changed that instead of the wild and doubting agony of his former utterance he exhibits rather a spirit which may be characterized as mild, plaintive, and in some measure composed.

The discourse falls into three divisions: (1) A justification of the previous lamentation, as entirely corresponding to the fearful greatness of Job's suffering, ch. vi. 2-10. (2) A sharp criticism of the friends' conduct as unreasonably hard, as demonstrating indeed the deceptiveness of their friendship, ch. vi. 11-30. (3) Renewed lamentation over his inconsolable and helpless condition, together with an arraignment of God, ch. vii. 1-21. These three principal divisions have the same relative proportions, both as to the length and sub-divisions of each, as the three divisions of the discourse of Eliphaz; the first consisting of one, the two following consisting each of two long strophes. It is only in the last two, however, of these five long strophes (to wit, ch. vii. 1-11 and vii. 12-21) that we find double-strophes composed of the longer strophes extending over 5-7 verses. The first three double-strophes on the contrary are composed of shorter strophes, including now three, and now four masoretic verses.

2. *First Division* (and *Long Strophe*). Justification of his former lamentation by a reference to the greatness and incomprehensibility of his suffering, ch. vi. 2-10.

First Strophe. Vers. 2-4. [His grief was not excessive when compared with his suffering].

Ver. 2. **Oh that my grief might be but weighed, and my calamity be laid up over against it in the balances**—[The use of the Inf. Absol. שָׁקוֹל with the Fut. יִשָּׁקֵל (used optatively after לוּ) shows the emphasis which Job's mind laid on the complete exact balancing of his vexation against his suffering.—E.] כַּעַשׂ, grief, discontent, despondency, is that with which Eliphaz had reproached him [see ch. v. 2. "Vexation, impatience, either the inner irritation, or outward exhibition of it, or both." DAV.] הַיָּתִי (for which the K'ri has הַוָּתִי, as also in ch. xxx. 13 לְהַוָּתִי for לְהַיָּתִי) "my calamity, my ruin;" comp. the plur. הַוּוֹת used elsewhere in the same sense, ch. vi 30; Ps lvii. 2 [1]; xci. 3; xciv. 20; Prov. xix 13. The two expressions are not synonymous (Kamph.), but are related to each other as subjective and objective, or as an effect produced in Job's emotional experience, and the cause of the same. Accordingly יִשְׂאוּ יַחַד can not signify: "that it might be laid up (weighed) all at once, altogether," *i. e.*, my entire woe, in which case indeed we should also expect the plur. הַיּוֹתַי (הַוּוֹתַי). But נשא יחד denotes a simultaneous weighing of the despondency and the calamity, a balancing of either over against the other (comp. ch. xvii. 16; Ps. cxli. 10; Is. xlv. 8). The whole is

a wish or a yearning prayer to God, to show clearly to his friends that his violent grief was most assuredly proportioned to the severity of his sufferings. [Conant objects to the view here given: "that it is not an appropriate answer to Eliphaz, whose admonitions were not based on the *disproportion* of the sufferer's grief to its cause." To which Davidson replies: "Job is not here replying to Eliphaz's whole charge, but only to the beginning of it (as was fit in the beginning of his reply), the charge of *unmanliness*, to which the words are an appropriate answer"].

Ver. 3. **For now is it heavier than the sand of the seas,** *i. e.*, heavy beyond measure. For the use of the expression "sand of the sea," as a figure to set forth a weight or burden of extreme heaviness (as elsewhere it is used to set forth an innumerable multitude), comp. Prov. xxvii. 3; Sir. xxii. 15.—יַמִּים, "seas," poetic plural, used like the sing. יָם in Gen. xlix. 13.—כִּי עַתָּה is rendered by Delitzsch, "for then" (as in ch. iii. 13), and the whole sentence he takes to be an inference from ver. 2: "then would it be found heavier than the sand, *etc.*" But this "it would be found" is simply interpolated into the text. Most modern expositors rightly render it: "For now, as the case now stands, especially in consequence of your unfriendly conduct," *etc.*—**Therefore do my words rave**—לָעוּ, with the tone on the penult, cannot be derived from לעה [Ges.], but either from לעע, or לוע, but not in the sense of sucking down, or swallowing, but in the sense, for which we have the warrant of the Arabic, of stammering, raving. [Fürst]. Job therefore admits that he has heretofore "spoken foolishly" (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 17, 21, 23), but he justifies himself by appealing to his insupportable sorrow. [The translation of the Eng. Ver. "my words are swallowed up," implying that he had been unable to speak from grief, is less significant, and less suitable to the connection than the confession that he had spoken madly: neither is it consistent with the usage of the verb elsewhere in an active sense; Obad. 16.—E.]

Ver. 4. **For the arrows of the Almighty are in me, whose poison my spirit drinks up.**—More specifically giving the reason for 3 *a*. By "the arrows of the Almighty" are meant the sickness, pains, and plagues which God inflicts on men: ["the emphasis lies on *Almighty*, the arrows of the Almighty; there was enough in that fact, in the awful nature of his adversary, to account and more than apologize for all his madness." DAV.] comp. Ps. xxxviii. 3 [2]; Deut. xxxii. 23; Ezek. v. 16; also below in our book, ch. xvi. 12 seq.—עִמָּדִי *i. e.*, lit. "with me," not "in my body" (ἐν τῷ σώματί μου, LXX. Pesh.). The form of expression is chosen to represent the arrows of God as something which has hurt and wounded not only his body, but also his soul and which accordingly is ever "with him," continually present to him (comp. ch. ix. 35; x. 13).—אֲשֶׁר חֲמָתָם, not the subj. of the relative clause (LXX., Pesh., Vulg., Rosenm. [E. V., Noy., Lee, Con., Carey], but its object, the subj. of which is rather רוּחִי "my spirit." חֵמָה "heat," here equivalent to "poison;" comp. ch. xxi. 20; Ps. vii. 14 [13]; lviii. 5; Deut. xxxii. 24, 33. ["Some prefer: the poison of which drinketh up my spirit, a meaning that would account for Job's prostration, the poison of God's arrows was like a burning heat that dried up and drank in his spirit. It was rather, however, his violence and vehement recrimination against God which he has to excuse; impetuosity, not impotence, has to be accounted for. It is thus better to make *spirit* nom., the spirit drinks in the Divine virus, which works potently, as Divine poison will, excites, inflames, maddens the spirit." Dav.].—**The terrors of Eloah storm me.** יַעַרְכוּנִי, an elliptical expression for יערכו מלחמה עלי, they set themselves in battle array against me, they assail me like an army: comp. Judg. xx. 30, 33; 1 Sam. iv. 2. Böttcher singularly attempts to render it (*Neue Exeget. Æhrenlese*, No. 1397): "the terrors of God cause me to arm myself—compel me to put myself in the right." Against this it may be urged that the "terrors of God" signify not Job's sufferings and distresses in themselves, and objectively considered, but his subjective experiences of the same, his consciousness of the fact that his suffering proceeds from the attacks and persecutions which God in His wrath directs against his life and his happiness in life (comp. ch. xxiii. 16 seq.). [They are "the conscious voluntary terrors which He actively originates, which He gathers from the ends of His dominion and the outlying posts of His power, and marshals like a sable infinite host against Job." Dav.].

Second Strophe: Vers. 5–7. [The demand that he should submit without a murmur unnatural].

Ver. 5. **Does the wild ass bray by the fresh grass, or doth an ox low at his fodder?** *i. e.*, I would certainly not lament without sufficient cause; far less would I be disposed to complain than an irrational beast, which is contentedly provided with fodder. The form of the comparison vividly reminds us of Amos iii. 4-6. —For נהק, to moan, to groan, to utter doleful cries, comp. ch. xxx. 7. Concerning the wild ass see the fuller description in ch. xxxix. 5-8.—בְּלִיל, maslin, farrago, a compound of various kinds of grain.

Ver. 6. **Is that which is tasteless eaten without salt, or is there flavor in the white of an egg?** *i. e.*, can it be expected of me that I should freely and joyously relish the unsavory food of suffering, and especially of that loathsome disease, which has seized upon me? That Job uses tasteless, loathsome food as a figure for the sufferings which afflict him, appears both from vers. 2-4, and from vers. 8-10, where the burden of these self-same sufferings prompts him to desire death. The interpretation which refers the figure to the discourses of the friends (LXX and other ancient expositors, also Rüetschi, *Stud. und Krit.*, 1867) is at variance with the connection. It suits indeed the expression in the first member of the verse (תָּפֵל tasteless; comp. rem. on ch. i. 22), but not the

expression "slime of the yolk of an egg," which is altogether too strong for unsuitable and harsh discourses, and which is most naturally referred to the nauseous filth, dust, and ulcerous matter of the leprosy (comp. ch. vii. 5). [Observe that the point of the illustration lies in the tendency of an agreeable quality, or the opposite, to produce content or discontent. Now as that which occasioned Job's discontent was his suffering, it is doubtless this suffering which in this verse he describes negatively as tasteless, and therefore to be complained of in the next verse as positively loathsome, and therefore to be refused.—Moreover, it is not until later (ver. 25 sq.) that Job comes to speak of the nature of his friends' remarks. He is here justifying his complaint which had been uttered before his friends had spoken at all, and which had been prompted by their silence, of which silence, as indicating a failure of sympathy, he again complains (vers. 15-21).—E.] —רִיר חַלָּמוּת, "the slime of the yolk," *i. e.*, the liquid saliva which encloses the solid part, the yellow yolk of an egg, hence the white of an egg, which was esteemed by the Hebrews to be particularly nauseating, or at least as altogether insipid. So, following the Targ. and some of the Rabbis, Rosenm., Umbreit, Ewald, Stickel, Del., Dillmann, [E. V., Hengst., Dav., Fürst, Schlottmann, Good], *etc.*, and in general most modern writers, while the Pesh., Arab., Gesen., Heiligst., Böttcher, [Renan, Merx], translate ריר חי "portulacca-broth, purslain-slime," a rendering, however, which assigns to ריר the sense, elsewhere unknown, of slime, broth, or soup.

Ver. 7. **My soul refuses to touch, such things are to me as putrid food.**—Rosenm., Welte, Delitzsch, (as before them the Vulg., Luther) [so also E. V., Noy., Ren., Elz.], take the first member as an antecedent relative clause without אֲשֶׁר, "that which my soul refuses to touch, *etc.*" But such an antecedent position for the relative clause when אֲשֶׁר is wanting, is a rare construction, and in order to obtain for the consequent clause a tolerable sense we should be obliged to amend כִּדְוֵי to כְּדֵי (as Rosenm. and Welte do in opposition to all the MSS. and Vsns.). Such a construction, moreover, destroys the progression of thought from *a* to *b*. The object of לִנְגּוֹעַ is supplied of itself in that which from ver. 2 on stands forth as the prominent conception, to wit, the suffering or calamity of Job, to which also the הֵמָּה, which stands at the head of the second member, points back, "they," *i. e.*, things of that sort, such things —כִּדְוֵי לַחְמִי, lit. "as the disease of my bread;" *i. e.*, as though my food were diseased, putrid, loathsome: דְּוֵי constr. state of דְּוַי, "sickness, disease," comp. Ps. xli. 4 [3] (so rightly Gesenius, [Fürst], Ewald, Olsh., Hahn, Schlottmann, Dillmann, *etc.*). Others (Cocceius, Schultens, Heiligstedt, Delitzsch) take דוי as constr. st. plur. of דָּוֶה, "sick, unclean" (comp. Isa. xxx. 22), according to which derivation, however, we should expect to read דְּוֹת. Umbreit and Hirzel (2d Ed.) explain "the disease of my bread" as meaning, "the disease which is my daily bread" [so also Wordsworth and Renan]; Böttcher would read כְּדַוֵּי: "they are according to the disease of my food;" Hitzig, after the Arabic, explains: "the crumbs of my food"—purely arbitrary evasions, and less natural than the construction followed by us.

Third Strophe: vers. 8–10. [He longs for death, and even in death would rejoice in his integrity.]

Ver. 8. **Oh that my request might be fulfilled** [lit. **might come**], **and that Eloah would grant my longing!** This prayer and longing are for death, as that which would bring release from his misery, which is all that he desires: see the verse which follows. מִי יִתֵּן the well-known optative formula, governing also the verbs of the following verse. ["It occurs quite frequently in the Book of Job, almost altogether, however, in Job's discourses, in the friends' discourses only in ch. xi. 5, not once in those of Elihu and God. This indicates purpose in the linguistic structure of the argument. Job's destiny gives him much *to wish for.*" HENGST.] Hupfeld's emendation, וְתַאֲוָתִי for וְתִקְוָתִי, is uncalled for.

Ver. 9. **That it might please Eloah to destroy me, that He would let down His hand to cut me off:** lit. "that He would let loose His hand, and cut me off;" for הִתִּיר, Hiph. of נתר, "to spring," signifies "to cause to spring, to unbind, set loose" (comp. Is. lviii. 6; Ps. cv. 20; cxlvi. 7); the hand of God is thus conceived of as having been hitherto bound—bound, that is, by His own will.—וִיבַצְּעֵנִי, "and cut me off," (not: "and crush me," Luther, comp. the LXX.: ἀνελέτω με). Job's soul, his *Ego* or his life, is, after the analogy of ch. iv. 21, regarded as an internal cord, a string, or thread, the cutting off of which is synonymous with death: comp. also ch. xxvii. 8; Ps lxxvi. 13, also the well-known Greek representation of the Parcæ.

Ver. 10. **So would it ever be my comfort.** . . . Delitzsch rightly: "With וּתְהִי begins the conclusion, exactly as in ch. xiii. 5." Most expositors extend the influence of the מִי יִתֵּן, ver. 8, over this sentence, and construe the verbs here also as optatives: "and that so my comfort may still be to me," *etc.* The comfort, according to this latter construction, would be Job's speedy death. But how a speedy death could in and of itself bring any comfort is not made to appear in this connection. It is more natural with Hupf., Schlottmann, Delitzsch [Bernard, Conant, Rodwell, Hengst., Renan], especially on comparing this with the analogous passage in Ps. cxix. 50, to find the statement of that which would bring comfort in the words of the last member: "that I have not denied the words of the Holy One," thus treating the second member, וַאֲסַלְּדָה וגו׳, as a parenthesis.—**I would leap in unsparing pain.** For the use of the cohortative (וַאֲסַלְּדָה) in a subjunctive sense in a parenthesis, comp. *e. g.* Ps. xl. 6;

li. 18.—סלד is to be explained after the Arab. *zalada* ("to stamp the ground, *tripudiare*") [to beat hard; hence the E. V.: "I would harden myself in sorrow," and so Lee, who explains: "Because there still is, or remains consolation, . . . I will not give way, whatever may be laid on me: or even though He cut me entirely off"], as also after the ἡλλόμην of the LXX. and the לְאַבִּיעַ ("I will exult") of the Targum. It is accordingly to be taken in the sense of a jubilant expression of joy, not in the sense of "being tormented" (Rosenm. after some of the Rabbis [who explain the verb to mean "burning;" and so Bernard]), nor: "to spring up through pain" (Schlottmann, who accordingly takes the parenthesis in a concessive sense: "although I leap up for pain").—לֹא יַחְמוֹל (comp. Is. xxx. 14 seq.), a relative clause, with the omission of the adverbial אֲשֶׁר: "wherewith he spares me not," namely, God, who is to be understood as the subject here (Rosenm., Ewald [who makes the omitted relative the direct object of the verb—"pain which he spares not;" a construction, however, which does not harmonize so well with the usage of חמל, which generally has a personal object. E.], Hirzel, Heiligstedt, Hahn, Schlottmann, Dillmann) [Renan, Hengst.]. Possibly חִילָה might be taken as the subject (so Umbreit, Vaih., Stickel) [Gesen., Rodwell, Conant]: "in pain which spares not," against which, however, it may be urged that, while חִילָה is most simply treated as fem., the verbal form used, יחמל, is masc. In any case, the translation; "in unsparing pain," corresponds to the sense of the poet.—**That I have not denied the words of the Holy One.** This fact—that he had been guilty of no denial (comp. ch. i. 22; ii. 10)—constitutes the firm confidence which Job possessed in the midst of all his distress and misery, and which he felt assured would show itself, even in death. The meaning is not essentially different which results from the other and more common construction of our verse, according to which the second member is not treated as a parenthesis, and כִּי is regarded as introducing a reason for that which precedes: "*for* I have not denied," *etc.*

3. *Second Division:* A lament over the bitter disappointment which he had experienced from his friends: ch. vi. 11-30.

First Long Strophe: vers. 11-20 (consisting of three short strophes, of 3, 4, and three verses respectively). ["In view of his broken strength and hopeless condition, he must reject their advice to trust in the future, and openly declare to them that he is completely disappointed in his expectations as to their friendship." DILLMANN.]

a. Vers. 11-13. [His helplessness, and consequent hopelessness. Ewald and Hengstenberg put this strophe in the First Division, to which, however, as Schlottmann has shown, there are two objections. First, it mars the completeness which the preceding long strophe possesses, when regarded as closing the triumphant declaration by Job of his integrity and confidence in God contained in ver. 10.—Secondly, the picture which this short strophe gives of his helplessness and hopelessness is preparatory to the picture which immediately follows of the deceptiveness of his friends, and in that position adds greatly to the pathos and effectiveness of his complaint. E.]

Ver. 11. **What is my strength that I should persevere [wait], and what mine end that I should be patient?** The answer to this question which Job's meaning would require is of course a pure negative: my strength is completely gone, and death is the only end which I look for, in all its nearness, nay more, with impatience. ["Two things are necessary that one may bear misfortune patiently; first, that the strength of the sufferer is in some proportion to the power of the suffering; and, secondly, that he sees before him an end, which, when reached, will reward the present struggle. Job denies both these things of himself, the first in ver. 12, the second in ver. 13." SCHLOTTMANN.] For הֶאֱרִיךְ נֶפֶשׁ, "to prolong the soul, to lengthen it," *i. e.* to be patient, comp. Prov. xix. 11; Is. xlviii. 9. [The rendering of E. V., "prolong my life," would rather require אַאֲרִיךְ יָמַי].

Ver. 12. **Or is the strength of stones my strength, or is my flesh of brass?**—[The first "*or*" tends rather to mar the connection. E.] A poetic illustrative expansion of the thought in ver. 11 *a.* [According to Hengstenberg, "stones" and "brass" are mentioned here because of their invulnerability. Rather, according to the connection, because of their power of endurance. Schlottmann says: "נחוש is properly always 'copper,' which the ancients, however, as is known, had learned to harden, so that in firmness it resembled iron." E.]

Ver. 13. **Verily, is not my help in me brought to nought?** lit.: "Is not the nothingness of my help with me?" הַאִם, which occurs elsewhere only in Num. xvii. 28 [13], is neither a strengthened interrogative אִם (Schlottmann), nor an inversion for אִם הֲ (Delitzsch), nor a collocation of the interrogative particle הֲ with the conditional particle אִם (whether, if my help is destroyed, *etc.*, Köster), but simply equivalent to הֲלֹא, in the sense of vivid interrogation or asseveration: "verily not" (Ewald, Dillmann). **And well-being driven away from me?** תּוּשִׁיָּה essentially the same as in ch. v. 12, well-being, enduring prosperity. The sense of the verse as a whole is: My condition is hopeless, and all promises for the future are therefore useless and null. [It is doubtless best to give to תושיה here the sense which, as Zöckler has elsewhere shown, belongs to it in the Chokma-Literature. Other interpretations are partial, and so far enfeebling: *e. g.* "wisdom," E. V., or "insight" (Hengst.), "deliverance" (Noyes), "solace" (Rosenm.), "restoration" (Conant). What Job says is that every element of real and substantial good had been driven away from him. Davidson is more nearly right when he

says, that not only was recovery driven away from him, "but that the possibility of it, anything which could spring, and be matured into health again, all inner strength and resource—the very base of recovery—was driven away or out of him." The word, however, is broader even than this, including all external as well as internal resources, a man's entire *establishment* of good.—E.]

b. Vers. 14-17: [He has been disappointed in the friendly sympathy which is accorded to every one in misery, but which, in his case, has proved as deceptive as a summer brook.]

Ver. 14. **To the despairing gentleness** (is due) **from his friends** (or, is shown by his friends), **and** [or, **even**] **should he have forsaken the fear of the Almighty.**—["The prep. in לָמָס does not express so much what is *due* . . . as what is actually given in affliction. Job's friends failed, not in giving what was due, the world and even friendship often does, but in giving what was actually and always given." DAV.] מָס from מסס, *liquefieri*, denotes literally one "who is inwardly melted, disheartened" (Delitzsch)—a term strikingly descriptive of Job's condition as one of complete depression, helpless prostration to the very ground.—חֶסֶד, "gentleness, friendliness, kindness" (comp. the πνεῦμα πραΰτητος of Gal. vi. 1), not "reproach," as Seb. Schmidt, Hitzig, and others would explain it, after Prov. xiv. 34; for in ch. x. 12 our poet again uses חֶסֶד in its ordinary sense, and the translation: "If reproach from his friends falls on one who is despairing, he will then give up the fear of God," gives a thought which is foreign to the context, and withal incorrect in itself. Equally untenable on grammatical grounds is the translation of Luther [and Wemyss; also of Merx, who however alters the text from לָמָס to מֹנֵעַ]: "He who withholds mercy from his neighbor, he forsakes the fear of the Almighty."—This rendering, however, although resting on the authority of the Targ., Vulg., and Pesh., is to be rejected on account of the singularly harsh construction of the לְ as a designation of the absol. case, as well as on account of its giving to the Partic. מס the unheard-of signification: "he who withholds, or refuses." The second member cannot be regarded as the conclusion of the first,—not even by taking וְ in the sense of *alioqui*, and so translating with Schnurrer, Delitzsch [Noy., Words., Rod., Hengst.], "otherwise he might forsake the fear of the Almighty" (*alioqui hic reverentiam Dei exuit*). Rather, if no corruption of the text be assumed, it will be found most simple and natural to regard the first member as an ardently expressed formula of desire, with an omitted jussive from the verb היה, or to supply "is due to, belongs to," [or "is given to"], and to find in the second member simply the continuation of the principal notion מָס, introduced by a concessive וְ: "and even if he should have forsaken" [Schlott., Dill., Ren., Lee, Dav.] (comp. Ges., § 134 [Con.-Roed., § 131] Rem. 2; Ewald, § 350, *b*).—Ewald, without necessity, would supply between *a* and *b* lines which, he assumes, had fallen out.*—The whole verse is evidently an expression of resentment at the fact that Eliphaz had exhibited no trace of gentle forbearance or sympathy for Job; he claims this sympathy for himself, even in case he had in his suffering departed from the fear of God, which case, however, he presents only as possible, not as actual. [Conant translates: "ready to forsake the fear of the Almighty;" Davidson: "to one losing hold of the fear of the Almighty." "Job," says the latter, "would not admit that he had forsaken, rather that he was forsaking, in danger of forsaking the fear of the Almighty." And again: "in his terrible collision in darkness and doubt with the unspeaking nameless (Gen. xxxii. 25) Being he was alone—absolutely—for the Father was against him, and when one is losing hold (יַעֲזוֹב) of God, he sorely enough needs a human hand to grasp, and the sufferer's pathos is overwhelming, when he sees God and man alike estranged."—The continuation of the participial construction by the Imperfect, with omitted relative (see Ewald, § 338, *b*), fully justifies this construction, which is at once most simple and expressive. "To one whose inner man is dissolving, whose faith and life are giving way, and who in that fearful dissolution is in danger of losing hold on God, to him surely sympathy from friends is meet."—E.]

Vers. 15-17. The conduct of Job's three friends in disappointing his hopes, illustrated by the comparison of a torrent, which in spring rushes along full and strong, but in summer is entirely dried up, an אַכְזָב, or "lying stream," as the same is described in Jer. xv. 18 (comp. the paronomasia in Mic. i. 14, בָּתֵּי אַכְזִיב לְאַכְזָב, "the houses of Achzib are become a lying stream to the kings of Israel").

Ver. 15. **My brethren have been false as a torrent,** *i. e.*, my friends, whom I have loved as brothers [אַחַי, placed first with special emphasis],—he mentions them all, because Eliphaz had spoken in the name of all (ch. v. 27)—have borne themselves treacherously towards me, have ministered to me an empty semblance of comfort, like the dried-up water of a *wadi.*—**As the bed of torrents which overflow.** יַעֲבֹרוּ not, "which vanish away" (Hirzel, Delitzsch [Hengst., E. V., Con., Dav., Noy., Carey, Ren.]), for while "passing away," or "vanishing," may indeed be predicated of the water of a brook, it cannot be used of the brook itself. Moreover, the continuation of the description given in the following verse, assumes the torrents to be full, not as yet in course of disappearing [and so Ewald, Dillmann, Schlott. Wemyss].

Ver. 16. **Turbid are they from ice:** קֹדְרִים black, foul, dark; here in the literal or physical sense, different from ch. v. 11.—**The snow hides itself in them**; or: "down upon which

* "To him who despairs there is love from a friend [*from a brother sympathy for him who is bowed down by God, in order that he may not succumb to the grief of his heart*], and forsake the fear of the Almighty."

(עֲלֵימוֹ) the snow hides itself;" a constr. prægnans, comp. Gesen., § 141 [§ 138].

Ver. 17. **At the time when heat comes to them they are cut off** [lit., **made silent**].—בְּעֵת יְזֹרְבוּ at the time when, or so soon as they are warmed. [עֵת in the constr. state, at the beginning of a temporal clause, with omission of the relative: see Ewald, § 286, *i;* 332 *d*]. זֹרַב, Pual of זרב, a poetic variant of צרב (Ezek. xxi. 3; Prov. xvi. 27), "to burn, to parch, to glow;" [and so E. V., Ew., Schlott., Del., Dillm., Dav., Carey, Hengst.—According to Ges., Fürst. Con., the meaning is: "at the time they are poured off," or "flow off;" *i. e.*, when the heat begins to melt the snow on the mountains. But as the first result of that is filling up the channels, the sense would be somewhat strained.—E.]. **When it is hot, they are dried up** [lit., **extinguished**] **from their place:** בְּחֻמּוֹ, in its becoming hot; *i. e.*, when it is hot. The suffix is to be taken as neuter, not (with Hirzel) to be referred to an עֵת that is understood; ("when it, the time of the year, becomes hot"); comp. Ewald, § 295, *a*.

c.—Vers. 18-20. A further description of the disappointment he had met with from his friends by a continuation of the simile of the treacherous torrents.

Ver. 18. **The paths of their course wind about, they go up into the waste and vanish.**—If, with the Masor. text, we read אָרְחוֹת the rendering here given is the only one that is admissible; the "ways" or "paths of their course" are in that case the beds of the torrents, which go winding about. and thus favor the rapid extinction of the torrent; their "going up into the waste" (עָלָה בַתֹּהוּ) is their gradual evaporation into the air, their ascent in vapors and clouds; comp. Isa. xl. 23; so correctly Mercerus: *in auras abeunt, in nihilum rediguntur;* so also Arnh., Delitzsch [Good, Barnes, Bernard, Words., Elzas]. Most modern expositors, however, correct the text here, and in the following verse to אֹרְחוֹת, plur. of אֹרְחָה (or also אֹרָחוֹת, plur. of אֹרַח, way, caravan), and translate either: "the caravans of their way turn aside" [a rendering, however, which is founded on the Masoretic text, regarding אָרְחוֹת as constr., and the meaning being "the caravans along their way;" so Conant, Davidson, Hengstenberg,—E.], or: "caravans turn aside their course, they go up into the wastes, and perish," [so Ewald, Schlottmann, Dillmann, Wemyss, Noyes, Carey, Rodwell, Renan, Merx]. The phrase עָלָה בַתֹּהוּ seems indeed to harmonize well with this explanation. But in that case ver. 18 would anticipate vers. 19, 20 in an unprecedented manner; after the statement of this verse, which by the expression וְיֹאבֵדוּ has already carried us forward to the complete destruction of the deceived caravans, what is said in those verses would drag along as a flat tautology. According to our interpretation ver. 18 completes the description of the treacherous torrents begun in ver. 15, while the two verses following dwell, with that epic repose and breadth which characterize the whole description, on the impression which such dried up torrents make on the thirsty caravans of the desert. [These reasons are certainly not wanting in force, still they are not conclusive. For (1) It is agreed by all that in the next verse אָרְחוֹת means caravans, and it is in the highest degree improbable that in two verses, so closely connected, describing the same general idea, and belonging to the same figure, the same word should be used in two different senses. (2). The language used, while most graphically appropriate according to one interpretation, can be adapted to the other only by strained constructions. This is especially true of the second member. "Going up into the waste," and "perishing," are surely far-fetched expressions for the evaporation and disappearance of water. On the other hand they are, as Zöckler admits, in admirable harmony with the other interpretation. Nothing indeed can be more exquisite in its pathos than the picture which they bring before the mind of a caravan, weary with travel and thirst, and still more weary with disappointment, winding along the channel of the torrent, wistfully exploring its dry bed for water, following its course upward, hoping that in the uplands, nearer the river's sources, some little pool may be found; hoping thus from day to day, but in vain, and so wasting away into a caravan of skeletons, until at last in the far off wastes it perishes. (3). The objection that this interpretation anticipates what follows, and thus produces a tame and dragging tautology, is answered by observing that the chief motive of the description just given is not to excite *pity* for the *fate* of such a caravan, but to justify Job's *resentment* at the *treachery* of which the dry *wady* is the type. Hence in the verses following Job emphasizes the *disappointment* which the caravan of Tema and Sheba (named by way of vivid individualization) would feel in such a plight. This is the burden of his accusation of his friends, *they had disappointed, deceived him.* This was to him, at this time, a more bitter fate than his destruction would have been; so that from his point of view, vers. 19, 20, so far from being an anti-climax, contain the very climax of his sorrow.—The suggestions to change יִלָּפְתוּ either to Kal, יִלְפְּתוּ (Fürst), or to Piel, יְלַפְּתוּ (Ewald) are unfortunate. No species could express more happily than the Niphal the helpless, semi-passive condition of an exhausted caravan, such as is here described, winding around, hither and thither, *led* by the channel in the search for water.—E.]

Ver. 19. **The caravans of Tema looked:** to wit, caravans of the Ishmaelitish Arabian tribe of תֵּמָא (Gen. xxv. 15), in northern Arabia (Is. xxi. 14; Jer. xxv. 23), which is mentioned here by way of example; so likewise in the next clause שְׁבָא, as to which see ch. i. 15.—[**The companies of Sheba hoped for them.** לָמוֹ is by most referred to the torrents; by Schlottmann, however, it is regarded as *Dat.*

commodi, and so suggesting the *eagerness* of their search. E.] The Perfects in this and the following verse give to the whole description the appearance of a concrete historical occurrence.

Ver. 20. **They were put to shame by their trust**: lit. "because one trusted;" comp. Ewald, § 294, *b*. The phrase כִּי בָטַח describes by individualization, wherefore it is unnecessary, with Olsh., to amend to the plur. בָּטְחוּ, or with Böttcher to read בָּטֵחַ (a form which nowhere occurs). **They came thither** (the fem. suffix in עָדֶיהָ in the neuter sense; comp. ver. 29), **and became red with shame**; as the result, namely, of their having been disappointed.—Observe the wonderful beauty of this whole illustration, which terminates with this verse. It is no less striking than clear and intelligible. The friendship of the three visitors was once great, like that rushing torrent of melting snow; now, however, in the heat of temptation, it has utterly vanished, so that the sufferer, thirsting for comfort, but meeting instead, first with silence, and afterwards with sharp and heartless censure, finds himself ignominiously deceived, like a company of travellers betrayed by a lying brook.

4. *Second Division.—Second Long Strophe* (subdivided like the first into shorter strophes of 3, 4, and 3 verses respectively); vers. 21-30. The complaint concerning the faithlessness of the friends is continued [in simple, non-figurative language], passing over, however, near the close (in strophe *c:* ver. 28 seq.) into an appeal for the renewal of their former friendliness.

a. Vers. 21-23. [The illustration applied, and the unfaithfulness of the friends shown from the unselfishness of the demands which Job had made on their friendship].

Ver. 21. **Verily, so are ye now become nothing.**—כִּי עַתָּה introduces the ground of the preceding comparison of the friends to the treacherous torrents: "for now (for as you now conduct yourselves towards me) you are become a nothing, a nullity," to wit, for me; I have nothing at all in you, neither comfort nor support. Such is the explanation according to the Masoretic reading: כִּי עַתָּה הֱיִיתֶם לֹא; here לֹא "not" means "nothing," as in one instance the Chald. לָה (=לָא): Dan. iv. 32. [Comp. לֹא תחטא, ch. v. 24; also the similar use of אַל, ch. xxiv. 25]. According to the regular Hebrew usage, we should certainly expect: הֱי׳ לְאַיִן or לְאֶפֶס; still the Targ. justifies our construction (adopted among modern expositors by Umbreit, Vaih., Schlottm., Hahn, Delitzsch [E. V.. Fürst, Davidson, Noyes, Wordsworth, Rodwell, Renan], *etc.*). According to the K'ri לוֹ, which in many MSS. is the reading even of the text, instead of לֹא, the explanation would be: "ye are become that" [the same]; *i. e.* ye are become a deceitful נחל, ver. 15, which, however, hardly gives a tolerable sense. Still more unsatisfactory is the rendering favored by the LXX., Vulg., Pesh., Luth., *etc.*, according to which the reading should be לִי, instead of לוֹ, "Ye are become to me." J. D. Michaelis, Ewald, Olshausen, Dillmann, also read לִי for לוֹ (לֹא), and in addition amend כִּי to כֵּן at the beginning of the verse: "so are ye become to me." This conjecture certainly yields a complete satisfactory sense; but the sentence as it stands with לֹא commends itself by its bolder and more comprehensive form of expression.—**You see a terror, and are dismayed.**—The words תִּרְאוּ and וַתִּירָאוּ form a paronomasia which cannot well be reproduced in a translation: the same paronomasia between רָאָה and יָרֵא occurs also in ch. xxxvii. 24; Ps. xl. 4 [3]; lii. 8 [6]; Zech. ix. 5. By חֲתַת [E. V. "casting down," but rather from חתת to be broken, crushed, metaphorically with fear: hence that which causes terror.—E.] Job means the fearful calamity which has come upon him, in the presence of which his friends stand astonished and dismayed, thinking they had to do with one who was, in some extraordinary sense, an enemy of God.

Vers. 22-23. ["Their cowardice in now renouncing their friendship is all the more striking, forasmuch as he has required of them no sacrifice, or heroic achievement in his behalf, a test before which a false friendship commonly fails, but—for such is his thought—only the comfort of words, and the aid of sympathy."—Dillmann.]

Ver. 22. **Did I ever say then, Give to me, and bring presents to me from your wealth?**—[הֲכִי, "is it that?—was your failure because I ever said?" שִׁחֲדוּ, Ewald § 226, *d*. Green. § 119: 4]. The question is in a vein of derision: Did I ever require any special sacrifice of you? [and in ver. 23] did I ever demand of you anything else, any other effort or achievement, than the exhibition of genuine compassion, of true brotherly sympathy? כֹּחַ here means wealth (*opes*), as in Prov. v. 10; Lev. xxvi. 10. Elsewhere we find חַיִל used in this sense.

Ver. 23. [**And deliver me out of the enemy's hand, and redeem me from the hand of the oppressor** (Renan: brigands)?] We are not specially to think here of a deliverance, or a redemption by means of a ransom—not, therefore, of a pecuniary ransom, although this thought is not to be excluded altogether.

b. Vers. 24-27. [A challenge to be convicted of wrong-doing, and a bitter upbraiding of the cruelty which had fastened on words spoken in agony.]

Ver. 24. **Teach me, then will I be silent** (*i. e.* I will cease my complaint); **and wherein I have erred show me.** From this urgent request, that he be openly instructed and admonished in regard to that of which he is assumed to be guilty, it is abundantly evident, that the conduct of his friends, when for seven days they sat with him in silence, had been felt by him as a mute accusation on their part, and a sore mortification to himself.

Ver. 25. **How sweet are words of rectitude** [*i. e.* right words]! מַה־נִּמְרְצוּ it is best to take as synonymous with מַה־נִּמְלְצוּ (comp. Ps. cxix. 103), "how sweet, how pleasant are," *etc.* According to this rendering, which is favored by the Targ. (also by Raschi, Schultens, Rosenm., Ewald, Schlottmann, Dillmann [Fürst, Renan, Wordsworth], *etc.*), the question in the second member of the verse, being introduced with an adversative ו, expresses a contrast with the first member: "but what does reproof from you reprove?" *i. e.* what does it avail or accomplish? הוֹכֵחַ, a substantive Inf. Absol. [used as subj., a very rare construction; comp. Prov. xxv. 27]. The construction adopted by the LXX., Aq., apparently also by the Pesh. and Vulg., is etymologically admissible. According to this, מָרַץ means: "to be sick, weak, in a bad condition," the sense of the passage being: "Why are the words of rectitude [*i. e.* my words] poorly esteemed by you? why do they seem to you worthy of blame?" This explanation, however, which is that essentially followed by Luther, Hahn, Ebrard [Umbreit, Hengst., Merx, who, instead of יֹשֶׁר, reads יָשָׁר, "the righteous man"], *etc.*, is made less probable in that it renders מה by "wherefore." Others (Kimchi, Delitzsch, v. Gerl.), [so also E. V., Ges., Good, Noyes, Barnes, Conant, Davidson, Carey, Rodwell, Elzas], render: "How forcible, how penetrative, are words of rectitude!" Whereas מרץ, however, can scarcely be the same with פרץ, this rendering lacks the necessary etymologieal justification. The same is true of Hupfeld's combination of the verb מרץ with מרה, מר, *acerbum acrem esse:* "how bitter words of uprightness can be!" Here, moreover, the rendering of מה by *quantumvis* is doubtful. [The word is used elsewhere twice in Niphal, as here: 1 Kings ii. 8, of a grievous curse, or "a curse inevitably carried out" (Del.); Micah ii. 10, of sore, unsparing destruction; and once in Hiphil: Job xvi. 3, in the sense of goading, provoking, and so stirring up to speak. The analogy of these passages favors the rendering: "How forcible!" To this add: (1) It agrees better with the subject, "upright, honest, sincere words." "Words which keep the straight way of truth, go to the heart."—DEL. Comp. what is said of the word of God in Heb. iv. 12. (2) The parallelism favors it, as thus: Words which proceed *from sincerity* are effective: they have force and pungency; but the words which have proceeded *from you* (מִכֶּם)—what force, what pungency, what reproving power, have they?—E.]

Ver. 26. **Do you think to reprove** (mere) **words?** *i. e.* will you, to justify your censorious treatment of me, fasten on my *words*—on *words* spoken by me without reflection in the excitement of passion (ch. iii.), instead of on the *fact* of my blameless conduct? The whole question attaches itself closely to ver. 25 *b*, and defines more closely the sense of that interrogative sentence: Do you think to make your reproof efficacious and profitable [exactly so: a good definition of נִמְרְצוּ: see above.—E.] in this way, by directing attention only to those words of mine? [הַלְהוֹכַח, Inf. constr. Hiph. with Pattach: Grn. § 126, 1]. **Notwithstanding the words of a despairing man go to the wind,** *i. e.*, notwithstanding you should know that the words of one in despair (נוֹאָשׁ) are necessarily inconsiderate and spoken at random, are therefore to be judged leniently, and not pressed to the quick. The same sense is also obtained if (with Delitzsch, *etc.*) ולרוּחַ וגו׳ be treated as a circumstantial clause, and translated: "while nevertheless the words," *etc.* Our adversative rendering of the ו however makes the expression stronger. [The preposition ל in לרוּחַ is rendered with slight variations. Ewald, Dillmann, Hengstenberg, Merx, like Zöckler, render it, "speaking to the wind." E. V., Con., Dav., Elz., Rod.: "as the wind." And so Carey: "for wind." Schlott., Noyes, Wem.: "but wind." Delitzsch and Renan: "belong to the wind" ("that they may be carried away by it, not to the judgment, which retains and analyzes them." DEL.).]

Ver. 27. **Ye would even cast lots for the orphan, and ye would traffic for your friend.**—The severest reproach which Job pronounces on his opponents in this discourse. [Renan introduces the verse with the objurgation, "Traitors!"] The two Imperfects express what they would do *in a given case,* and are thus conditional or subjunctive, as in ch. iii. 13, 16. With תַּפִּילוּ is to be supplied גּוֹרָל, after 1 Sam. xiv. 42. [Some suppose the figure in both clauses to be taken from hunting, and supply accordingly רֶשֶׁת, net, in the first: "You spread a net, and dig a pitfall for your friend." Hengstenberg would supply "stones:" "you would stone your friend." E. V., Good, Elz.: "cause to fall," *i. e.*, overwhelm, fall upon. But as Zöckler proceeds to say]: A casting of lots for an orphan might take place when unrelenting creditors appropriated the children of their deceased debtors as slaves by way of payment. Comp. 2 Kings iv. 1. With כָּרָה in the second member, Rosenm., Gesenius, Heiligstedt, supply שַׁחַת, "a grave" [so also E. V., Good, Noyes, Wem., Carey, Rod., Elz., Hengst.]. But partly the context, partly the similar expression in ch. xl. 30, as also passages like Hos. iii. 2, Deut. ii. 6, assure the signification of כָּרָה עַל to be: "to conclude a bargain for any one, to sell, to traffic in any one," *viz.*, as slaves. Comp. Gen. xxxvii. 27 sq. [So Ewald, Dillmann, Delitzsch, Wordsworth, and Schlottmann, who argues that the ellipsis of רשת in the first member is without any analogy: that for the ellipsis of שחת in the second the use of חפר in Ps. xxxv. 7 cannot be cited, seeing that there שחת occurs in the first member, and that the construction with עַל, "to dig a pit against one," would be harsh and unprecedented.]

Vers. 28–30. [An urgent appeal to consider the righteousness of his cause. Observe the

sudden and touching transition from the bitter outbreak of ver. 27, as though himself alarmed at the violent expression of his feelings, the reaction bringing back with it something of the old trust in his friends.—E.]

Ver. 28. **And now be pleased to look on me.**—Immediately following upon the severest reproof the discourse changes its tone to that of mild entreaty and adjuration. פָּנָה בְּ, to turn the face to one, to consider attentively. Comp. Eccles. ii. 11. **And of a truth I will not lie to your face**: *i. e.*, in maintaining unrighteously and untruthfully my innocence. אִם is the particle used in a negative oath, or a solemn asseveration that this or that is *not* the case (Gesen. § 155 [§ 152], 2 f.). [The rendering of E. V.: "for it is evident unto you, if I lie," is unfortunate in its use of the present, "is;" for as Conant says: "though it was so clear to Job himself, he could not assert that it was so evident to them." This objection, however, is obviated, if, with Gesenius, we supply the future: "it will be before your face (*i. e.*, evident) if I lie;" or if, with Hengstenberg, we supply the optative: "let it lie before your face (*i. e.*, let it be determined by you, be ye judges) whether I lie." In favor of the one or the other of these constructions, which are substantially the same, it may be said: (1) It establishes a better connection of the first and second members of this verse. Having entreated them to give earnest attention to his case, he assures them that they will be satisfied with his truth. (2) It is in better harmony with the suddenly subdued and almost plaintive tone which characterizes this strophe than the strenuous asseveration that he would not lie to their faces. (3) It brings the structure of the verse into conformity with that of the verse following, where we have the same earnest entreaty, followed by the same assurance of a satisfactory conclusion. (4) Ver. 30 seems to be the expansion of the same thought. (5) The construction is much simpler and less harsh. —E.]

Ver. 29. **Return, I pray**—*i. e.*, not: "come hither, in order to hear my complaint" (Schlott., Kamph.), which would be trivial and inexpressive; nor: "begin again" (*i. e.*, try it again, v. Gerl., Del.),—a sense which cannot be referred to the simple objectless שׁוּבוּ. But the meaning is rather: "Return from the path of hostility and unfriendly suspicion towards me, on which you have entered." For the absolute use of שׁוּב, to be converted, to return (to Jehovah), comp. Jer. iii. 12, 14, 22; 2 Chron. vi. 24, *etc.* **Let there be no wrong**—*viz.:* on your side, through your continuing to torture me, *etc.* **Yea, return, I am still right therein.**—With the K'ri we are to read וְשׁוּבוּ, a reiterated urgent request that they should hear him without prejudice. The K'thibh, וְשׁבִי, admits of no satisfactory explanation. [One commentator, *e. g.*, supposes that Job is here addressing his wife! Some (*e.g.*, Hengstenberg) that he is addressing his cause (personified), which his friends had dismissed as adjudicated. Others, as Schultens, regard the word as Inf. with suffix; "my return," *i. e.*, I will return, or again go over my case, and establish its righteousness. But, as Schlottmann remarks, this is undoubtedly one of the few cases where the K'ri is to be preferred. Renan, following, perhaps, a hint already furnished by the LXX.: καθίσατε (probably reading שְׁבוּ), supposes that, stung by Job's reproaches, especially in v. 27, the friends had made a movement to depart. An ingenious but a needless conjecture, which weakens the importunity of Job's appeal for an impartial trial of his cause.—E.] "I am still right therein, [or lit.] my righteousness is still in it," *i. e.*, in the matter which we are considering [in my cause]; I still stand innocent and unconvicted in this business.

Ver. 30. **Is there wrong on my tongue?** *i. e*, have I really thus far (in that complaint, ch. iii.) spoken wrong? He does not therefore admit that in his vehement murmuring and cursing and lamenting he has erred; he will only acknowledge that his words have been "spoken to the wind," *i. e.*, thoughtlessly (v. 26), not that they are blameworthy or godless. **Or does not my palate** (חֵךְ here, as in chap. xii. 11, as the organ of taste) [here of course in the figurative sense of moral discrimination] **discern calamities?** *i. e.*, do I not possess so much of a right judgment and understanding that I can discern the true import of my misfortune, that I can know whether my suffering is or is not deserved? To assign to הַוּוֹת another sense than that which belongs to the sing. in v. 2, is not suitable. Schlottmann, Dillmann, *etc.*, interpret it rightly in the sense of "calamities, misfortunes," while most expositors adopt the signification, "wickedness, iniquity" ("the wickedness which completely contaminates feeling and utterance." Del.), a signification which is scarcely supported by its use in other passages. [Besides its correspondence with the sing. in v. 2, the sense here given for הַוּוֹת is favored by the comparison of suffering with food in vers. 6, 7, and also by the circumstantial and painful description of his sufferings, into which he plunges in the following chapter. This view, moreover, results in less tautology than the other.—E.] For the sense of the passage, as a whole, it matters not whether we translate as above, or: "does not my palate discern iniquity?" In any case, Job by this question gives evidence of his entanglement in Pelagian notions, under the influence of which he will plead guilty neither to error nor to wrong.

5. *Third Division:* A return to the previous lamentation because of his fate, and an accusation of God: ch. vii. 1-21.

First Long Strophe: Vers. 1-11, (subdivided into two strophes of 6 and 5 verses): A lamentation over the wearisomeness of life on earth in general, and over his own hopeless condition in particular.

a.—Vers. 1-6. [Job's weariness of life on account of its misery and brevity. "In antagonism to Eliphaz's fascinating picture of the Supreme, the Father directing all the currents of creation's influence for mercy and good, Job's inflamed eye throws up against the sky in gigantic outline an omnipotent slave driver, and fills the earth with miserable wretches overworked by day, and shaken by feverish weari-

ness and dreams of torture by night."—Davidson].

Ver. 1. **Has not man a warfare on earth, and are not his days like the days of a hireling?**—["The fact that Job in ver 1 brings his suffering into connection with the misery of the whole human race, indicates progress in relation to ch. 3, where, predominantly at least, he limited himself to the representation of his individual condition. By this advance the question concerning God's righteousness and love receives a much more forcible significance. The question is no longer about a solitary exception, which may have a secret personal reason for its existence. Job now stands forth as representative of the whole of suffering, oppressed humanity, arraigning God because of His injustice." Hengstenberg. אֱנוֹשׁ, used continually in Job, as in the Psalms, of man in his weakness and mortality: comp. ch. v. 17; vii. 17; xiii. 9; xiv. 19; xv. 14; xxv. 6; or of man in his insignificance and impurity as contrasted with God: comp. ch. iv. 17; ix. 2; x. 4, 5; xxv. 4.—E.]. By many the verse is translated: "Has not man a service [the service, *viz.*, of a vassal] on earth, and are not his days as the days of a hireling?" (so *e. g.* Hahn, Vaih., *etc.*). But in the original text the figure first presented is rather the military one (צָבָא, military service, soldiering, as in ch. xiv. 14; Is. xl. 2; Dan. x. 1) ["in silent antithesis to Eliphaz's fascinating picture, ch. v.," Dav.], while the figure taken from the peaceful life of a tiller of the soil (שָׂכִיר, hireling, one who works for wages, comp. ch. xiv. 6) follows in the second member. This latter comparison, belonging to the sphere of agricultural life, is continued in the more detailed description of the following verse.

Ver. 2. **Like a slave, who pants after the shadow** [scil. of evening; see Gesenius], **and like a hireling who waits for his wages.** The כְּ used in each member is not the continuation of the כְּ in כִּימֵי־שָׂכִיר, ver. 1, but stands in cor-relation to the כֵּן which begins ver. 3, that verse being the apodosis to this. [For the reason just given the translation should not be: "as a slave he pants, *etc.*" Neither: "as a slave pants," which would be כַּאֲשֶׁר]. פֹּעַל that which is earned by working, wages: comp. Prov. xxi. 6; Jer. xxii. 13; also the synonymous פְּעֻלָּה, Lev. xix. 13; Is. xl. 10, *etc.* [The reward of the day's labor is to be understood as being looked forward to by the laborer here not so much for its own sake, as because it marks the close of the day's work, because having received his wages he *rests.*—E.]

Ver. 3. **So months of wretchedness are allotted to me, and nights of distress are appointed for me.**—יַרְחֵי־שָׁוְא is translated by Delitzsch [Schlott., Hengst., Davidson, E. V.]: "months of disappointment," which certainly corresponds more nearly to the literal signification of שָׁוְא (vanity, nothingness, falsehood, the opposite of תּוּשִׁיָּה), but furnishes no point of comparison that is altogether suitable in connection with what precedes. Moreover the signification: "wretchedness, misfortune is sufficiently assured for שָׁוְא by ch. xv. 31; Is. xxx. 28 [and so Umbr., Ew., Dil., Noy., Con.]. הָנְחַלְתִּי, lit., "I am made to inherit, are appointed to me as my lot" (נחלה), with accus. of the object. The Passive expresses "the compulsoriness of the lot" (Hirzel). ["A pathetic word, made to inherit, through no cause or fault of mine, it is the mere arbitrary effect . . . of the will of him whose slave I am. לִי adds force to the passive, both show the non-participation of Job in causing his troubles, and his helplessness to dispose of them." Davidson]. From the *months* of wretchedness to the *nights* of distress, there is a progression in the thought; the latter are related to the former as the sharp and sudden destruction effected by a bombardment to the preceding and accompanying sufferings which a protracted siege produces among those who are beleaguered. [Dillmann states the progression thus: "in contrast with the *days* of the hireling are the *months* and even the nights of the misery." It seems scarcely necessary, however, to assume a progression here. The term "months" indicates the long *duration* of the suffering, the term "*nights*" indicates its incessant *recurrence*, and is chosen, moreover, because it is in the night that the pressure of pain is most keenly felt.—E.]. Our verse is, however, one of the most decisive evidences that our poet imagined a wide interval to have elapsed between the outbreak of Job's disease and the beginning of the controversy; comp. above, on ch. ii. 11.—[On מִנּוּ, 3d plur., used indefinitely "without any thought of the real agency concerned in the action spoken of, and where the English would require a passive construction," see Green, ꝟ 243, 2, *b*].

Ver. 4. **When I lie down, then I think,** [lit., say]: **When shall I arise, and the night be gone?** וּמִדַּד־עָרֶב is commonly translated: "and the night lengthens itself, the night stretches itself out long" (מִדַּד, Piel of מדד, written with Pattach: comp. Gesenius, ꝟ 52 [51], Rem. 1). The accents, however, favor rather the rendering adopted by Raschi, Mercerus, Rosenm., Delitzsch, [and so E. V., Noyes, Con., Dav., Carey], according to which מִדַּד is the const. st. of a verbal noun from נדד, the meaning of the noun מַדָּד being "flight, departure," and the sense of the entire clause being: "when will the flight of the evening be? when will the evening come to an end?" That עֶרֶב is by this interpretation regarded as synonymous with לַיְלָה furnishes no valid reasoning against this rendering; for the word has this meaning no less according to the other rendering, and in general means this quite often in Hebrew; comp. Gen. i. 5 seq. ["The night is described by its commencement, the late evening, to make the long interval of the sleepiness and restlessness of the invalid prominent." Delitzsch].—**And I become weary with restlessness until the dawn.**—נֶשֶׁף, here as in ch. iii. 9, the morning dawn. נְדֻדִים, lit., the rolling around, tossing

to and fro on the bed. The word forms a paronomasia with מִדַּי, as Ebr. and Delitzsch rightly remark. [Thus in English: "When will the night toss itself away? And I am weary with tossings until the dawn." And this paronomasia is not without weight as an argument in favor of the interpretation given above to מִדַּד in ver. 4.—E.].

Ver. 5. **My flesh is clothed with worms and crusts of earth.** רִמָּה, decay, rottenness, which passes over into worms, vermin; comp. ch. xvii. 14; xxi. 26.—גִּישׁ, for which the K'ri substitutes the common reading of the Talmud, גוּשׁ, is elsewhere "clods of earth;" here crusts, scabs, such as cover indurated ulcers [used here, says Delitzsch, because of the cracked, scaly, earth-colored skin of one suffering with elephantiasis].—**My skin heals** (רָגַע, shrinks together, contracts, becomes hard and stiff) **and breaks out again**, lit., "is again melted," [festers again], יִמָּאֵס, a variant of יִמַּס (comp. Ewald, § 114 *b*) [Green, § 139, 3], Ps. lviii. 8.

Ver. 6. **My days pass away more swiftly than a weaver's shuttle.** אֶרֶג not the "web" itself, as the Pesh. and Vulg. render it, but the shuttle, *κερκίς, radius;* comp. ch. ix. 25, where precisely, as here, swift motion forms the point of comparison.—**And vanish without hope,** *i. e.*, without hope *of deliverance* (comp. ch. ix. 25, 26), not: without hope of a better lot after death, as Hirzel, Hahn, Delitzsch, *etc.*, explain, with a reference to ch. xiv. 12, 19. The reference to the life beyond is as yet altogether foreign to the connection. [The rendering of Good, Wemyss, Elzas assumes אֶרֶג to mean yarn for the web, the verb קלל "to be slight," and תִּקְוָה thread; and so they translate:

> "My days are slighter than yarn,
> They are finished by the breaking of the thread."

What is thus gained, however, in the symmetrical completeness of the figure, is lost in depth of feeling. There is inexpressible pathos in the sentiment that his days are wasting away (יִכְלוּ) without hope; the use of the preposition בְּאֶפֶס lit. in the extreme end, at the vanishing point, being also exquisitely appropriate.—E.]

b. Vers. 7-11: A plaintive plea for God's compassion, out of which, however, the suppliant sinks back into hopeless lamentation.

Ver. 7. **Remember that my days are a breath** (רוּחַ, wind, breath of air, the same as הֶבֶל, ver. 17), **that mine eye shall never behold prosperity.** Lit. "will not return to see;" or mine eye will nevermore see good,—when it is broken off, that is, in death, when, therefore, this earthly life of mine shall reach its end. It is not the absolute cessation of all sight, observation, consciousness, life in general, that Job here affirms of the Hereafter, but only that he will cease to behold happiness and well-being (טוֹב, as in ch. ii. 10; xxi. 13; xxxvi. 11; Ps. iv. 7 (6); xxv. 13; xxxiv. 13 (12), *etc.*), that days of prosperity will never return: and so in the three verses following.

Vers. 8, 9. **The eye of him who looketh after me shall see me no more.** עֵין רֹאִי, the eye of my beholder, my visitor, and so of my friend, who comes to see me and to comfort me. So according to the reading רֹאִי, with the tone on the last syllable, while the accentuation רֹאִי for רָאִי, preferred by Arnheim, Stickel, Vaihinger, *etc.*, pausal form, would give the sense, which here is less suitable [and which Schlottmann justly characterizes as insipid]: "an eye of seeing=a seeing eye." [Comp. ראה in 2 Sam. xiii. 5; 2 Kings viii. 29].—**Thine eyes** (supply: look, are turned) **towards me: I am no more.** The address, as in the preceding verse, is directed to God: If Thou seekest me there, I shall be no more; Thou wilt therefore be able to show me no manner of kindness. [The anthropomorphism of a heart stung by pangs of the bitterest disappointment: I have been deceived in my fondest hopes, when I looked for sympathy and help, they were not to be found. So be it! The day will come when perhaps Thou wilt feel moved to show me some kindness, but—too late. Thou wilt look for me among the living—but I shall not be.—E.] That the "being no more" is to be understood, not absolutely, but only relatively, is evident from the following verse, which, through the simile of the cloud which vanishes without leaving a trace of it behind, illustrates the hopelessness of the return of the departed from Sheol, not, however, their complete annihilation. Concerning שְׁאוֹל, Hell, *i. e.* the underworld, the realm of the dead (to be derived, indeed, from שָׁאַל, "to demand," rather than from שָׁעַל, "to be hollow"); comp. notes on Prov. i. 12; ii. 18; vii. 27; Cant. viii. 6. ["שְׁאוֹל is now almost universally derived from שָׁעַל=שָׁאַל, to be hollow, to be deepened; and aptly so, for they imagined the *Sheôl* as under ground, as Num. xvi. 30, 33, alone shows, on which account even here; as from Gen. xxxvii. 35 onwards יָרַד שְׁאוֹלָה is everywhere used. It is, however, open to question, whether this derivation is correct: at least passages like Is. v. 14; Hab. ii. 5; Prov. xxx. 15 seq. show that in the later usage of the language, שָׁאַל, to demand, was thought of in connection with it: derived from which *Sheôl* signifies (1) the inevitable and inexorable demand made on everything earthly (an infinitive noun like פְּקוֹד ,אֱלוֹהַּ; (2) conceived of as space, the place of shadowy duration, whither everything on earth is demanded; (3) conceived of according to its nature, the divinely appointed fury which gathers in and engulfs everything on the earth."—Del.]

[Ver. 9. **The cloud is vanished** [or consumes away), **and is gone** (a figure particularly expressive in the East); **so he that goes down to the underworld cometh not up.** See on ver. 8.]

Ver. 10. **He returns no more to his house, his place knows him not again**; *i. e.* his home (מְקוֹם, as in ch. viii. 18; xx. 9; Ps. ciii. 16 [with which the second member corresponds *literatim*]), which formerly on his return from a journey rejoiced and greeted him as it were, will not recognize him again (עוֹד), even because he will not return. Of any hope of a resurrection to new life and prosperity in life Job manifestly exhibits *here* no trace: no more is it the case in ch. x. 21; xiv. 10 seq.; xvi. 22.—It is otherwise on the contrary in ch. xix. 25 seq.

Ver. 11. [This verse Schlottmann, Conant, Wemyss, Davidson, Carey, Renan, connect with the next strophe: while Noyes, Dillmann, Del., agree with Zöckler in placing it at the end of the present strophe. Ewald and Hengstenberg treat it as an independent verse, a passionate convulsive outcry of rebellious discontent in the midst of the plaintive moaning of a crushed and helpless heart, which pervades the rest of the chapter.—E.]—**Therefore will I also not restrain my mouth, I will speak in the anguish of my spirit**: *i. e.* since God hears me so little, since He abandons me so pitilessly to the lot of those who dwell in the realm of the dead, therefore neither will *I on my part* (גַּם אֲנִי for this so-called גַּם *talionis*, compare Ezek. xvi 43; Ps. lii. 7 (5); Hab. ii. 9, *etc.*) give any heed to Him, rather will I let my grief and anguish have free course. **I will complain in the anguish of my soul**: lit. in the bitterness of my soul; comp. ch. x. 1, as also the adjective phrase מַר נֶפֶשׁ, disturbed, troubled in soul: 1 Sam. i. 10; xxii. 2, *etc.*

6. *Third Division. Second Long Strophe:* vers. 12–21 (consisting of two strophes of five verses each): A vehemently passionate arraignment of God on account of the unrelenting severity with which He persecutes and oppresses him.

a. Vers. 12–16. [" The first conceivable cause of Job's troubles—he might be a *menace* to heaven." Dav.]

Ver. 12. **Am I a sea, or a monster** [of the deep], **that Thou** (כִּי as in ch. iii. 12; vi. 11) **settest a watch upon me?** מִשְׁמָר, "guard, watch-post," an expression which strictly belongs only to the second element in the comparison, the תַּנִּין (sea-monster, dragon, whale), being less suited to the first. A watch is set, however, on the raging and tossing sea by means of dams and dikes (comp. ch. xxxviii. 8 seq.; Jer. v. 22; xxxi. 35). [Schultens quotes from an Arabic poet, who calls Tamerlane "a vast sea, swallowing up everything."] According to Hirzel, Delitzsch, *etc.*, we are to understand by יָם the Nile, and by תַּנִּין the crocodile. This interpretation, however, rests on grounds equally insufficient with the specifically Egyptian reference which is fancied to lie in various other figures and descriptions of our book; comp. Introduction, ¿ 7. [" The image must be left in all its magnitude and generality; if there is any particular reference, it is in יָם to the tumultuous primitive abyss which God watched and confined, and still watches and enchains (Ps. civ. 9) lest it overwhelm the world; and in תַּנִּין to those vast creatures with which the early waters of creation teemed, Gen. i. 21."—Dav. and so Schlottmann.]

Ver. 13. **When I think, my bed shall comfort me.**—כִּי, when, so often as; as in ch. v. 21 *b*. [There is no good reason for rendering אָמַרְתִּי "I think," rather than "I say." As Hengstenberg says: In violent grief thought passes easily into words.] The whole verse is the protasis, to which vers. 14, 15 form the apodosis. **My couch shall help to bear my complaint.**—[מִשְׁכָּב, the general word, place of lying; עֶרֶשׂ, canopied couch]. נָשָׂא בְ, to help to bear anything [בְּ partitive] *sublevare*, as in Num. ii. 17; comp. Neh. iv. 4, 11. [" The vast images called up by the terms 'sea' and 'sea-monster' are very significantly followed by those of the 'bed' and 'couch,' as comforters and helpers sought in vain, bringing before our minds the littleness of man's lot." Schlott.] For שִׂיחַ, complaint, comp. ch. ix. 27; x. 1. xxi. 4.

Vers. 14, 15. **Then Thou scarest me** [וְחִתַּתַּנִי, liter. "Thou shakest me"] **with dreams, and makest me to tremble through visions of the night.**—מֵחֶזְיֹנוֹת, "out of visions," and so through them, in consequence of them.—**So that my soul chooseth strangling.**—ו in וַתִּבְחַר introduces a consequent to that which precedes, "and so then, in consequence of those terrifying dreams and visions, my soul chooseth strangling." **Death rather than these my bones**: *i. e.* rather than this body reduced to a skeleton; comp. ch. xix. 20. The מִן in מֵעַצְמוֹתָי is comparative, not causal—"death which is produced from these bones" (Stickel, Rüetschi), or again—"death from my own bones," *i. e.* by my own hand, suicide (Merx, Umbreit, Schlottmann, [Carey]). The last interpretation is by no means supported by מַחֲנָק, which signifies only strangling, not self-strangulation (comp. words of analogous structure like מַרְמָס, מוּצָק, and Ewald, ¿ 106, *c*). [Although the sing עֶצֶם is used of self, it would be forced and against all usage to take the plur. in that sense, or in the sense of members, hands. Moreover, the usual force of מִן after בָּחַר is comparative. To this add what is said in the following extract from Avicenna of the sensation of suffocation in elephantiasis. This description of himself as "bones" is most strikingly suggestive when compared with the conception of himself as a "sea" or a leviathan in ver. 12, capable of vexing and obstructing the Almighty. "There is fearful irony in the comparison of this skeleton, impotent and helpless, his very weakness a terror to himself and his onlookers, to the great heaven-assaulting ocean, lifting itself up in the consciousness of infinite power, or to some dragon of the prime in which the whole energy of creation in its youth lay compressed" (Davidson).—E.] With the description here given of the symptoms of elephantiasis in its advanced stages, comp. what Avi-

cenna says in his description of the same: "During sleep there come frequent atrabilious dreams. . . . . The breathing becomes excessively hard and labored. There is severe constriction of the chest, and extreme hoarseness. The lips become thick and black, and the body is covered with lumps, and becomes entirely black. It often becomes necessary to open the jugular vein to relieve the hoarseness and the tendency to suffocation," *etc.*

Ver. 16. **I loathe it**—מָאַסְתִּי—not: "I pass [waste] away" (Rosenm., Stick.) [Conant, Renan], but "I despise," *viz.*, life—I am disgusted with life. That this is to be supplied as the object of the verb, which is used absolutely, is made apparent by the clause immediately following: "I would not live always." [Those who render מָאַסְתִּי "disappear," take the remainder of the line as in like manner affirming Job's mortality. Thus Conant: "I waste away, I shall not live always."] **Let me alone**—*i. e.*, desist from continually assailing and besieging me, from the מִשְׁמָר of ver. 12. The request is addressed to God (not to Job's own life, as Hahn thinks), and expresses not a humble modest desire, but a stormy demand on the part of Job, sorely distressed as he was, and so weary of life. [Hence Davidson renders it: "Away from me!"] On the reason given for this request: "for my days are a breath," comp. v. 7 *a* (רוּחַ=הֶבֶל).

b. Vers. 17–21. ["The other conceivable cause of Job's sufferings, *sin.*" DAV. "The discourse in these verses assuming a calmer tone, as if to justify the vehemence of his doubt." Ew.]

Ver. 17. **What is man that Thou magnifiest him, and that Thou settest thy mind on him?**—These questions (in this and the following verse) parody in deliberate form and with bitter irony the words of Ps. viii. 5 sq. (comp. Ps. cxliv. 3; Lam. iii. 23). "There it is said that God exalts puny man to a kingly and divine position among His creatures, and distinguishes him continually with new tokens of His favor; here, that instead of ignoring him, He makes too much of him, by selecting him, insignificant as he is, as the object of ever new and ceaseless sufferings." DEL. ["David's 'What is man that thou shouldst think of him to bless him?' is turned into 'What is man that thou shouldst think of him to curse him?'" DAV. Herein lies the wonderful irony of the passage. Wordsworth: "Why shouldst thou break a fly upon a wheel?"]

Ver. 18. **And that thou visitest him every morning?**—On פָּקַד, to visit, inspect, comp. above on ch. v. 24, also Ps. viii. 5. **And every moment triest him?**—תִּבְחָנֶנּוּ, *i. e.*, puttest his patience and power to the test continually, and by sufferings which are ever renewed.

Ver. 19. **How long dost Thou not look away from me?**—כַּמָּה, lit.: how much? how often? here in the sense of *quamdiu*, construed with the Imperf. in the sense of a Future, as in Ps. xxxv. 17. שָׁעָה with מִן, to look away from, as in Isa. xxii. 4; here in the special sense of turning away from any one a look expressive of displeasure and punishment, exactly as in chap. xiv. 6, where moreover שָׁעָה is connected with מֵעַל. **Nor lettest me alone till I swallow my spittle**—*i. e.*, for one little instant—a proverbial expression for a minimum of time, in use also among the Arabians and Persians; comp. Schultens and Umbreit on the passage.

Ver. 20. **If I have sinned** (חָטָאתִי, an elliptical conditional clause, comp. Ewald, § 357 *b*), **what could I do** (thereby) **to Thee?**—[the fut. אֶפְעַל in the potential sense]: *i. e.*, what harm would I thereby occasion to thee? what detriment would I cause to Thy self-sufficient greatness and glory? (comp. chap. xxxv. 3–8, especially ver. 6). Ewald and Olshausen construe מָה אֶפְעַל־לָךְ as a relative clause of more precise specification, dependent on חטאתי, and so equivalent to an accus. of this verb: "If I have sinned in what I do to thee." Grammatically possible, but much tamer and less emphatic than our rendering. ["If I have sinned in what I do unto thee, why hast thou made me thy mark?" would be, says Conant, "a challenge without any pretence of justification." It would certainly involve a meaningless *non sequitur*. If Job *had* sinned, that certainly was a reason why God *should* set Himself against him. The clause מה־אפ׳ is thus needed to mediate between חטאתי and למה שׂ׳.—E.] **Thou watcher of men!**—This appellation, which of itself is one that conveys praise of God and comfort to men (comp. Ps. cxxi. 3; Isa. xxvii. 3), is used here not *sensu bono*, but with bitter irony, in the sense of an austere pitiless scrutinizer of men, without giving it, however, the shamefully frivolous sense given in Renan's rendering: *O espion de l'homme.* ["This sense of being continually tracked, of having the Divine shadow ever at his heels, following him about with evil eye, speechless but malevolent, puts the sufferer out of himself. How long wilt thou not look away from me? What is the meaning of this horrible espionage?" DAVIDSON.] **Wherefore dost Thou make me thy point of attack?**—מִפְגָּע, the object against which one rushes, or impinges (פָּגַע בְּ), an expression of not exactly the same, but yet of similar signification with מַטָּרָה, "target," in ch. xvi. 12; Lam. iii. 12. ["Such an obstacle the Deity had made to Himself of Job. Job was in His way. He was perpetually striving against Him—a tremendous figure." DAV. This is vividly put: the conception of a perpetual stumbling-block in God's way, however, is scarcely the one conveyed by the term. The idea here and in chap. xvi. 12 is that Job was a mark, against which God deliberately directed His power. There the figure is drawn from archery; here from war.—E.] **So that I am become a burden to myself**: (ו consec. as in ver. 15 *a*; the whole expression as in 2 Sam. xv. 33). The LXX. read here עָלֶיךָ (*εἰμὶ δὲ ἐπὶ σοὶ φορτίον*), and moreover the Masoretic tradition affirms that one of the eighteen corrections

of the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible (תִּקּוּנֵי סֹפְרִים) obtains here, the original עָלֶיךָ having been set aside on account of its objectionable meaning [being too bold or blasphemous]—"wherefore became I a burden to Thee?"—and exchanged for the less objectionable עָלַי. In any case, this latter reading gives a striking sense.

Ver. 21. **And why dost Thou not pardon my transgression?**—וּמֶה (with the vowel *e*, according to Ewald, § 152 *b*) [Green, § 75, 1], here=וְלָמָה. The question expresses what was to be expected, instead of the incessant hostile assaults of God on him, the presumed sinner, if he had really transgressed,—namely, the pardon of his guilt, since verily his end was now nigh. [**And put away my iniquity.**—According to Hengstenberg, there lies a certain irony in the use by Job of the strong expressions פֶּשַׁע and עָוֹן to designate the sins which to his consciousness proceeded only from infirmity.] For הֶעֱבִיר (to pass over, to overlook, ἀγνοεῖν) as a synonym of נָשָׂא, to bear, to forgive, comp. 2 Sam. xii. 13; xxiv. 10. **For now shall I lie in the dust, and if Thou seekest after me, I am no more**—*i. e.*, death will soon hurry me away, and Thou wilt then have no further opportunity to show me favor; unless therefore Thou doest this immediately, Thy character will be seen to be that of a cruel being, who unnecessarily torments men. This reason for the question: why will not God forgive without further question or delay? is akin to the thought in vers. 7 *a*, 8 *b*, and 16 *b*.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. In poetic elevation of thought, nervous strength of expression, and in wealth of figurative ornamentation, this first discourse of Job is not inferior to that of Eliphaz. It resembles the same also in that it conducts the argument more upon the basis of that Divine wisdom which belongs to mankind universally than of that which is specifically theocratic, and serves to express a religious consciousness which is firmly rooted in faith in a personal God (Eloah, Shaddai). That, however, which it sets forth as the contents and voice of this consciousness, with its faith in Jehovah, is no less obnoxious to the charge of one-sidedness, of beclouding the truth by many wrong representations and religiously impure sentiments, and indeed of partially eclipsing the same by grave errors, than the contents and tendency of that discourse of Eliphaz. There are one-sided representations, partly related and partly opposed to those of Eliphaz, to which we see Job here giving his adherence. Like him he is inclined to regard being a man and committing sin, or sensuousness and sinfulness, as inseparably connected together, and accordingly to look on the forgiveness of sin by God as a matter of course—as something which is to be expected on the part of man without giving himself any further concern on the subject (ch. vii. 21; comp. vi. 14; vii. 7, 8, 16). But in the disposition which he shows to make his sin as small as possible, to represent himself as in the main guiltless, and his friends as unjustly suspecting his innocence (chap. vi. 10, 24, 26, 29 sq.; vii. 20), he in turn comes in conflict with Eliphaz, the zealous champion of the universal sinfulness of all men. In consequence of the unqualified way in which he rejects the conjectures of the latter respecting his moral guiltiness in the matter of his suffering, he exhibits a stronger pelagian bias, greater self-righteousness, and more of the conceited arrogance of virtue, than his opponent. And when he upbraids him, and the two other friends who are like-minded with him, with a want of love, with a lack of gentleness, and even with a faithless neglect of their duty to comfort him (ch. vi. 11–20; especially ver. 14 sq.), this reproach seems—even quite apart from the bitter satirical tone in which it is clothed—in so far intemperate and exaggerated, in that he most decidedly declines to allow himself to be charged *by them* with any crime whatsoever, and so finds in their conduct *only* unfriendliness, hostility, and bitterness, and on the other hand wholly misapprehends the partial truth of that which is said by Eliphaz in their name. So far is he from submitting to being exhorted by them to penitence, that he seems rather to think he must preach repentance and conversion *to them* (chap. vi. 29)—like so many church-goers of our day, who, under the influence of pelagian prejudice and rationalistic blindness, complain of their preacher that, instead of ministering to them the consolation of the Gospel, he does nothing but exhort them to repent, thereby showing his own need of repentance (on account of "fanaticism, intolerance, hypocrisy, muckerism, obscurantism [puritanical bigotry]," *etc.*). Comp. Hengstenberg, p. 202: "It should not be overlooked that suffering would not have inflicted its crushing power on Job to such a degree if he had possessed the foundation of a theodicy in a deeper knowledge of human, and especially of his own, sinfulness. It is the lack of this that first gives to his suffering its real sting. . . . For the sufferings of this life sometimes wax so great that a moderate knowledge of what sinfulness is will be found altogether inadequate. Job's description in this section shows that very clearly. Its lesson is that even the mildest and most moderate pelagianism, or semi-pelagianism, must inevitably lead in its consequences to blasphemy."

The most doubtful point of antagonism to Eliphaz into which Job is led is when, instead of complying with his repeated exhortations to humble himself beneath the mighty hand of God, he falls rather into the tone of bitter, angry contention and litigation with God, and goes so far as to accuse Him of injustice and want of compassion, speaking of the poisoned arrows of the Almighty which are in him (ch. vi. 4), attributing to God the purpose, or at least the disposition, to crush and destroy him, even though he had in no wise sinned against Him (ch. vi. 9, 10), charging Him with making ceaseless hostile assaults upon him, and decreeing wanton tortures for him (ch. vii. 12 sq.), and with reference to this giving Him in bitter sarcasm the name of a "watcher of men" (in the unfavorable sense of the expression), a hostile sentinel or jailer of men

(ch. vii. 20). And these harsh and presumptuous speeches against God are accompanied by no qualifications, or partial retractions, such as we find in nearly all the lamentations of the Psalmists, or of the Prophet Jeremiah, where they make use of similar expressions, and represent God now by this, and now by that figurative expression, as their unsparing persecutor, and their stern unpitying judge. Job persists in all that he says in this direction of a doubtful character; he takes nothing of it back; he concludes his discourse immediately after the most passionate and presumptuous of these sayings has passed from his lips. Comp. Delitzsch (i. 131 seq.): "We should be mistaken if there were sin in the expressions in themselves considered by which Job describes God's hostility against himself. We may compare, *e.g.* Lam. iii. 9, 10: "He hath inclosed my ways with hewn stone; He hath made my paths crooked; He is to me as a bear lying in wait, as a lion in the thicket." It is, moreover, not Job's peculiar sin that he thinks God has changed to an enemy against him; that is the view which comes from his vision being beclouded by the conflict through which he is passing, as is frequently the case in the Psalms. His sin does not even consist in the inquiries, How long? and Wherefore? The Psalms, in that case, would abound in sin. But the sin is *that he hangs on to these doubting questions, and thus attributes apparent mercilessness and injustice to God.* And the friends constantly urge him on still deeper in this sin, the more persistently they attribute his suffering to his own unrighteousness. Jeremiah (in ch. iii. of the Lamentations), after similar complaints, adds: Then I repeated this to my heart, and took courage from it: the mercies of Jehovah, they have no end; His compassions do not cease, *etc.* Many of the Psalms that begin sorrowfully end in the same way; faith at length breaks through the clouds of doubt. But it should be remembered that the change of spiritual condition which, *e. g.* in Ps. vi., is condensed to the narrow limits of a lyric composition of eleven verses, is here in Job worked out with dramatic detail as a passage of his life's history: his faith, once so heroic, only smoulders under ashes; the friends, instead of fanning it to a flame, bury it still deeper, until at last it is set free from its bondage by Jehovah Himself, "Who appears in the whirlwind."

2. Notwithstanding these manifold tokens of a profound and grievous darkening of soul from which Job suffered during this discourse, it presents scattered through it much that is true, much that is directly conducive to the knowledge and appropriation of revealed truth. To these points of light, in which is comprised whatever in the two chapters is really significant in a doctrinal and ethical respect, belong:

(*a*) The beautiful sentiment: "*To one that is despairing gentleness is due from his friends, even though he should have forsaken the fear of the Almighty*" (ch. vi. 14); a genuine pearl of ethical theological wisdom, an unconscious prophetic saying, anticipating from afar such New Testament utterances as: "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick" (Matt. ix. 12); or: "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness" (Gal. vi. 1); or: "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins" (James v. 19-20; comp. 1 Pet. iv. 8).

b. The sorrowful lamentation over the misery of human life at the beginning of ch. vii. (vii. 1-6), which, even in those parts of it that have special reference to Job's fearful sufferings as a leper, admits of a measure of generalization, and analogical extension to the condition of all men as sinners, and as suffering in consequence of their sins. For not only that which in this earthly life, with its thousand troubles and hardships, resembles the service of the soldier and of the hireling, but also the months of evil which are to be lived through, and the nights of misery which are to be watched through, likewise the many harbingers of death and of decay, swallowing up the bodily life corroded and disintegrated by diseases of all kinds (comp. vers. 3-5) —all this even suits more or less the experience which all men have of life, inasmuch as there is no one, under the present order of existence, who is absolutely free from the law of sin and death, which through our first parents has descended upon all the race; comp. Rom. vii. 24, 25; viii. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 16, *etc.*

c. Connected with this lamentation is *the reflection upon the evanescence and vanity of the days of man on earth,* as well as upon the injustice and cruelty which would be exercised, if God should treat a being so weak and frail, so much like a breath in his nothingness, only according to the severity of His justice, and not rather according to the gracious fulness of His love and mercy (ch. vii. 7 seq.—especially ver. 21). In Job's sense, indeed, who does not adequately appreciate the bitter malignity and ill-desert of sin, and who is inclined, in view of the helpless moral misery of mankind, to rest his appeal for the forgiveness of his sins by God, not on the ground of its being fitting, but on a ground of formal *right,* this reflection is inadmissible before God, proceeding equally from the pride of the natural man, and from moral levity. It sounds almost like the frivolous remark of a Voltaire, or a Heine, like the notorious saying: "*Dieu me pardonnera, c'est son metier!*" At least it enables us to forebode how frivolous men might gradually reach such an abyss of wicked principles and of outrageous continued sinning against God's grace!—But even this reflection exhibits a certain relationship to those deep and undeniable truths in respect to the weakness of the natural man, and the necessity of pointing him to the power of divine grace which alone can deliver him, and which the Old Testament embodies in such expressions as those of Ps. lxxxix. 48; xc. 5 seq.; cii. 12 (11); ciii. 14, but the New Testament in its testimonies, infinitely more consoling, to the salvation which is found only in Christ, such as Acts iv. 12; Rom iii. 23 seq.; viii. 34 seq.; xi. 30 seq.; Gal. iii. 22; Eph. ii. 8 seq., as well as in the not less comforting assurances of the gracious hearing which our Heavenly Father will

grant to all prayers addressed to Him in the name of Jesus, and in trust exercised only in His grace (Luke xi. 5–13; xviii. 1-8; John xiv. 13 seq.; xvi. 23 seq.). Comp. Hengstenberg, p. 215: "Job cannot once give up the thought that God is a God of love, and so it seems to him to contradict His nature if, through the immediate prospect of death, the opportunity is taken away from Him of making amends for His severity by love."

d. Finally, the way in which Job, in ch. vii. 7-10, expresses himself *concerning his destiny after death*, though not properly belonging to the luminous side of his discourse, should still be reckoned among those expressions in it which contain positive instruction, and which are important in the development of the Old Testament Revelation. In this gloomy description of the dismal prospect beyond the grave, Job is as far as possible from exhibiting any hope of a resurrection, especially such as is so distinctly and gloriously revealed in Christianity. *He knows nothing of such a hope.* Just as little, however, does he know anything of any annihilation of his existence, of its total extinction after death. His disconsolateness in view of certain and near death is not that of the materialistic atheist. or of the heathen sage, who, with the hope of a resurrection, abandons also all hope of immortality. When in ver. 8, and in like manner, in ver. 21, he speaks of soon "being no more," this strong expression explains itself by means of the parallel passages which surround it, as meaning that he shall be no more on this earth, that this earthly life and earthly happiness will never again return (see ver. 7 *b;* 8 *b;* 21 *c*), but that, on the contrary, he anticipates a cheerless and prospectless confinement in Hades. He recognizes an existence after death, but one that is necessarily devoid of happiness, unilluminated by a single ray of the Messianic grace of salvation glimmering from afar. His outlook into the Hereafter is essentially one with his dread of Hades, the "king of terrors," the realm of a never-ending death-gloom, a desolate and horrible darkness relieved by no light (comp. ch. x. 20 sq.; xx. 9 sq.; also the similar gloomy descriptions of the condition of being in Hades in the Psalms: Ps. vi. 6 [5]; xxx. 10 [9]; lxxxviii. 11 [10] sq.; cxv. 17; in the Proverbs, in Ecclesiastes, *etc.*). He evidently belongs as yet to those who are groaning under the yoke of bondage to death, which preceded the coming of Christ, those whom the Epistle to the Hebrews designates as *τούτους, ὅσοι φόβῳ θανάτου διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν ἔνοχοι ἦσαν δουλείας* (ch. ii. 15). He stands, at least in the preceding discourse (it is otherwise later in ch. xix. 25 sq.), decidedly on the stand-point of those who, being as yet subject to the *œconomia Legis*, had not learned to view the destiny of the dead in the mild light of the grace of Jesus Christ. Comp. Brentius: "The condition of death or of Hades is such that by its own nature it holds all whom it embraces, and releases them not until Christ, the Son of God, shall by death descend into Hades, *i. e.* until He shall have died; for through Him, death and Hades being conquered, as many as have been renewed by faith are set free." Also Delitzsch (i. 130 sq.): "From this chaotic conception of the other side of the grave, against which even the psalmists still struggle, the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead had not been set forth at the time of Job, and of the author of the book of Job. The restoration of Israel buried in exile (Ezek. xxxvii.) first gave the impulse to it; and the resurrection of the Prince of Life, who was laid in the grave, set the seal upon it. The resurrection of Jesus Christ was first of all the actual overthrow of Hades. . . . We shall see by and by how the more his friends torment him, the more he is urged on to the longing for a future life (*i e.* a bright Hereafter, full of life and being, a Hereafter worthy of the name): but the word of revelation, which could alone change desire into hope, is wanting. The more tragic and heart-rending Job's desire to be freed by death from his unbearable suffering is, the more touching and importunate is his prayer that God may consider that now soon he can no longer be an object of His mercy."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

A sermon on the whole of the preceding discourse of Job must have two chief divisions: I. Job's complaint concerning his friends as poor comforters, ch. vi. II. Job's arraignment of God as his cruel, merciless persecutor. In both divisions it would be necessary to set forth so much of Job's utterances as is blameworthy, perverted, and one-sided, along with that which is of a higher character (such as, in the First Division, that passage particularly, which, from Job's stand-point, is comparatively justifiable, in which he claims *gentle* treatment, chap. vi. 14; and in the Second Division, more particularly the opening and closing verses of chap. vii.).—In view of the length of the whole discourse, it will be better, for the most part, to divide it into two texts, corresponding to the usual division by chapters, having in view a final consideration of both chapters. The following thoughts from ancient and modern practical commentators may serve as hints for the homiletic treatment of *particular passages*.

Chap. vi. 2 sq. Starke: The cross must be weighed not according to reason, but in comparison with the future glory, 2 Cor. iv. 17.—Zeyss: That which the much afflicted Job said of the greatness, heaviness, and severity of his suffering, might with much more justice and in the truest sense be said of the suffering of our Redeemer.

Chap. vi. 11 sq. Brentius: Most truly, and at the same time most impatiently, Job confesses that he cannot endure patiently such torments of hell. . . . Verily, although it is impossible for the flesh to stand in judgment, in Christ all things are possible, and by His virtue even hell is conquered. When, therefore, you hear it said that no amount of fortitude will suffice to bear the wrath of God, you may learn to fear the Lord and to commit yourself to His hands, so that you may be delivered; for He says: Be of good cheer, for I have overcome the world.

Chap. vi. 14 sq. *Idem:* Ungodly hypocrites—if at any time they see one in affliction, they presently revile him with much chiding and upbraiding, and seeking out every thing about him

from infancy up that is most disgraceful, if they do not report it, they at least suspect it. . . . . On the contrary, it is the nature of piety to plead, to reprove, to be urgent, εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως, so long as the Lord spares, and grants time for repentance. For He Himself also bears the wicked with the utmost long-suffering, to the end that He might in the meanwhile by doctrine, exhortation and reproof persuade them to repentance.

Ch. vi. 22 sq.: OSIANDER: Our flesh is altogether restive under the cross, and is wont to show particular resentment toward friends if they do not immediately come to our relief.—STARKE (on ver. 24): A wise man is glad to be admonished when he has erred; James iii. 17.

Chap. vii. 1 sq. SEB. SCHMIDT: Each of these (the servant and the hireling) continues in perpetual toils and miseries. Every man may rightly be compared with either, seeing that throughout his life he is overwhelmed with toils and miseries, looks in vain for rest before death.—STARKE: Our present life is nothing else than a service. Well for us if therein we serve God; but woe be to us if we yield ourselves to the service of sin; Rom. vi. 13.—WOHLFARTH: Human life is a continuous strife and conflict; a conflict with the infirmities of the body, with the sufferings of this life, with sin! But why does thine eye look sad? Where there is strife, there is victory; and more than all, a noble prize is put before the Christian to strive for, both in this life and in the life beyond.

Chap. vii. 5, 6. WEIM. BIB.: Our life is empty and fleeting, and all human beauty is perishable; Ps. cii. 4; cxliv. 4; ciii. 15.—WOHLFARTH: How swift the ceaseless flight of time! How rapidly the moments resolve themselves into hours, the hours into days, the days into months, the months into years! How much even the longest human life resembles a short dream of the morning! Yes, our life hastes away like a weaver's shuttle, like a breath, like a cloud!

Chap. vii. 8-10. BRENTIUS (on ver. 9): A beautiful comparison. As a cloud passes away, vanishes, and returns not, so he who goes down into the under-world, and never returns from thence. . . . In Hades there is no redemption through the feeling of despair, or by one's own strength or virtues, but there is abundant redemption even in hades through the Lord's compassion and restoring grace. (Comp. also the words of this expositor quoted above near the end of the Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks.)

Chap. vii. 12-16: To those who are tried it seems as though God had shut them up in a dark prison, or had even thrust them from Him, while they are still in His hand!—It is not an uncommon thing for those who are tried to be haunted by the purpose of taking their own life; these persons must not be allowed to go unwatched.—WOHLFARTH: How shall we overcome the temptation to suicide?

Chap. vii. 19-21 (on ver. 19): COCCEIUS: One of two things is to be desired by the godly: either that they may live without fear, that they may enjoy some good in this life, by which they may understand that God is at peace with them, and does not wish to show forth His wrath and justice towards them; or that they may die speedily. Now the godly live in perpetual afflictions and trials, or at least they are always troubled with anxiety and fear concerning them. Hence nothing is more natural than that they should desire to die at once For truly to live without comfort is harder than to die. And so human nature is not able to bear even the least pressure of God's wrath. Hence it is plain to see what every discourse of Job's aims at, to wit, to possess the comfort of the Gospel —JOACH. LANGE: We must truly humble ourselves under the mighty and heavy hand of God (1 Pet. v. 6). Only then do we come to know ourselves, and become poor in spirit, when we become a real burden to ourselves (ver. 20 *c*). And that is then the right way of becoming rich towards God (Matth. xi. 28; Luke xii. 21).—STARKE: All saints should with Job pray God for the forgiveness of their sins (Ps. xxxii. 6). . . . He who is assured of the forgiveness of his sins can die peacefully and joyfully, Luke ii. 29.—See Remarks by Hengstenberg and Delitzsch above, under "Doctrinal and Ethical."

II. Bildad and Job: Chaps. VIII—X.

A.—Bildad's rebuke: Man must not charge God with unrighteousness as Job has done, for God never does that which is unjust:

CHAPTER VIII.

1. Censure of Job on account of his unjust accusation against God:

VERS. 2–7.

1 Then answered Bildad the Shuhite, and said:

2 How long wilt thou speak these things?
and how long shall the words of thy mouth be like a strong wind?
3 Doth God pervert judgment?
or doth the Almighty pervert justice?

4 If thy children have sinned against Him,
and He have cast them away for their transgression;

5 If thou wouldest seek unto God betimes,
and make thy supplication to the Almighty;
6 if thou wert pure and upright,
surely now He would awake for thee,
and make the habitation of thy righteousness prosperous.
7 Though thy beginning was small,
yet thy latter end should greatly increase.

2. Reference to the wise teachings of the ancients in respect to the merited end of those who forget God:

VERSES 8-19.

8 For inquire, I pray thee, of the former age,
and prepare thyself to the search of their fathers:
9 (For we are but of yesterday, and know nothing,
because our days upon earth are a shadow):
10 Shall not they teach thee, and tell thee,
and utter words out of their heart?

11 "Can the rush grow up without mire?
can the flag grow without water?
12 Whilst it is yet in his greenness, and not cut down,
it withereth before any other herb.
13 So are the paths of all that forget God,
and the hypocrite's hope shall perish:

14 Whose hope shall be cut off,
and whose trust shall be a spider's web.
15 He shall lean upon his house, but it shall not stand;
he shall hold it fast, but it shall not endure.
16 He is green before the sun,
and his branch shooteth forth in his garden.

17 His roots are wrapt about the heap,
and seeth the place of stones.
18 If He destroy him from his place,
then it shall deny him, saying, I have not seen thee.
19 Behold, this is the joy of his way,
and out of the earth shall others grow."

3. A softened application of these teachings to the case of Job:

VERSES 20-22.

20 Behold, God will not cast away a perfect man,
neither will He help the evil doers:
21 Till He fill thy mouth with laughing,
and thy lips with rejoicing.
22 They that hate thee shall be clothed with shame;
and the dwelling-place of the wicked shall come to nought.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The aspect which this first discourse of Bildad's presents to us is far from being particularly controversial or violent, such as would correspond to the conjectural signification of the name בלדד, = "son of strife" (see on ch. ii. 11). It attaches itself to the conclusion of the preceding discourse of Job, in that it at once proceeds to show how entirely unjust is Job's conduct in accusing God of a want of compassion, and of despotic harshness, whereas God in determining the lot of mankind never acts other-

wise than justly (vers. 2-7). He then illustrates and supports the proposition that God causes an evil and sudden end to overtake those who apostatize from him by certain wise proverbial sayings of the ancients (vers. 8-19). He closes by prominently setting forth the twofold activity of the retributive justice of God (vers. 20-22), a conclusion which is so far conciliatory in its tendency in that it gives stronger expression to the hope that Job, through repenting of his sin, would experience the justice of God *rewarding* him, than to the fear of the opposite, or a warning of the consequences of his impenitence. [" It is to be specially noted in this connection B. makes no reply to the harsh personal reproaches of ch. vi. 14-27, but confines himself to the subject-matter." Dillmann]. Of the three divisions of the discourse, which are somewhat unequal in length, the first comprises 2 strophes, the second 4, the third 1, each of three verses.

2. *First Division:* Rebuke of Job's unjust accusation of God, as though He were unmerciful and unjust towards him, vers. 2-7.

First Strophe: Vers. 2-4. [The certainty that retributive justice will punish the sinner].

Ver. 2. **How long wilt thou speak such things?** עַד־אָן, as elsewhere עַד־אָנָה (ch. xviii. 2; xix. 2): lit. until when, *quousque tandem* [" An exclamation of impatience." Dav. " The friends had expected that after so thorough and unanswerable an argument as that which Eliphaz had delivered in their name, Job would at once acknowledge himself convinced, an expectation which Eliphaz himself had confidently announced at the close of his discourse. —The fact proves to be just the reverse: Job speaks more defiantly than at first. And so Bildad introduces his discourse with his exclamatory עַד־אָן, a veritable *Quousque tandem abutere patientia nostra.*" Schlottm.] אֵלֶּה, these things, *i. e.*, such things as thou hast spoken. [Said contemptuously, as also רוּחַ in the next member]. **And the words of thy mouth are a boisterous wind?** Properly a continuation of the preceding interrogative construction: " how long shall the words of thy mouth be a boisterous wind?" *i. e.*, like such a wind in respect of their emptiness [and bluster], as well as of their sweepingly destructive tendency (comp. ch. xv. 2; xvi. 3; 1 Kings xix. 11). For כַּבִּיר, poetic synonym of גָּדוֹל (ch. i. 19) comp. ch. xv 10; xxxi. 25; xxxiv. 17, 24; Isa. xvii. 12. [The word is peculiar to the book of Job and Isaiah].

Ver. 3. **Will God pervert the right, or the Almighty pervert justice?** *i. e.*, canst thou think for thy part that, *etc.?* Canst thou in sober earnest accuse God of injustice? " Observe the repetition of the verb יְעַוֵּת, on which there rests an emphasis which for Job was particularly stinging." Umbreit. [Davidson, *e. g.*, more correctly on the whole perhaps: " the repetition of *pervert* shows that it is not the emphatic word, while the variation of the divine names, as well as their position at the head of the clauses, throws the emphasis on the Divine Being—will *God, etc.*" The distinction between מִשְׁפָּט and צֶדֶק is substantially that already given by Schultens: the former designates the justice of God as embodied in act, *actio judicandi;* the latter as a principle or rule in the Divine mind.—E.].

Ver. 4. **If thy children have sinned against him.**—Only to spare Job's feelings Bildad avoids saying: " *because* thy children have sinned," and so leaves it apparently uncertain whether this formed the ground of the Divine decree concerning their fate—but only apparently, since he clearly regarded this decree as a punishment for their sins, as the conclusion proves. [Conant thinks this hypothetical use of אִם to be " not at all in the spirit of Bildad." He takes it to be concessive—" though thy sons have sinned against Him, and He hath given them, *etc.*, if thou thyself wouldest seek God, *etc.*" To which it may be objected: (1) This makes the protasis needlessly long. (2) It destroys the evident contrast between verses 4 and 5: between the hypothetical proposition concerning the children's sin in the former, and the conclusion therefrom, and the similar hypothetical proposition concerning Job's repentance in the latter, and the conclusion therefrom in vers. 6, 7.—אִם is undoubtedly used in the same way in both propositions, and if conditional in the latter, is conditional also in the former. At the same time it does not seem that Bildad uses אִם in the former case out of any particular consideration for Job's feelings. He uses it apparently in its purely logical sense, and this, too, with an assumption of the truth of the supposition which makes itself felt throughout the entire verse.—E.]—**Then hath he given them over into the hand of their transgression.** וַיְשַׁלְּחֵם, lit., " then hath He let them go into the hand, (*i. e.*, into the power) of their transgression," subjected them to the influence of their guilt. [" An expression of fearful energy" (Dav.) implying the self-retaliatory power of sin, the certainty that the moral order of the universe, enforced by the Divine will, will punish the transgressor.—E.] Comp. ch. ix. 24; Judg. iv. 9; 1 Sam. xxiii. 20.—Concerning the retrospective reference of the verse to ch. i. 19, comp. Introd., § 8, No. 3.

Second Strophe: Vers. 5–7. [The certainty that retributive justice will reward Job, if pure.]

Ver. 5. **But if thou seekest earnestly unto God.**—שִׁחֵר אֶל־אֵל, constr. prægnans, as above ch. v. 8: דָּרַשׁ אֶל־אֵל, to sue God for anything, to turn oneself to Him with earnest entreaty. אַתָּה, thou, puts Job in emphatic contrast with his children (ver. 4 *a*), as one who still has time to repent and to be reconciled, as the condition of the restoration of his prosperity. [**And makest supplication to the Almighty.**—Davidson calls attention to the " fine force of reflex Hithp., seek to make God gracious to oneself." Observe also in this verse as in ver. 3 the use in parallel clauses of *El* and *Shaddai*, the names most suggestive of God's power to uphold the moral order of the universe, thus using the terror of the Lord to persuade Job. —E.]

Ver. 6. **If thou art pure and upright.**—

This new conditional clause is not co-ordinate with the preceding, but subordinate to it: "provided, namely, thou art really pure and upright, if it be really the case that thou," *etc.* **Surely then He will awake for thee.**—כִּי עַתָּה, "surely then, verily then," emphatic introduction of the conclusion, as in ch. xiii. 18.—יָעִיר עָלֶיךָ, He will awake, arouse Himself for thee (comp. Ps. xxxv. 23), namely, for thy protection and deliverance; not: He will watch over thee, take thee under His care (Hirzel, Delitzsch [Dav., Renan, Merx] *etc.*), which would be altogether at variance with the usual signification of the verb הֵעִיר. **And restore** שִׁלַּם, *in integram restituet;* the LXX correctly: καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει) **the habitation of thy righteousness**, *i. e.*, the habitation where thou, as a righteous man, dost dwell and enjoy the fruits of thy righteousness (Dillmann).—On נוה see on ch. v. 3.

Ver. 7. **And if thy beginning was small thy end shall be exceeding great.**—In addition to the restoration of his former prosperity he promises him something new and yet more glorious, an unconscious prophecy of that which in the end actually came to pass (ch. xlii. 12), exactly like the promise of prosperity in the latter part of Eliphaz's discourse: ch. v. 8 sq. וְאַחֲרִיתְךָ יִשְׂגֶּה מְאֹד, lit., "and thy last end (thy latter estate, in contrast with רֵאשִׁיתְךָ, thy former estate, thy prosperity in the beginning) will flourish greatly." אַחֲרִית is here exceptionally and *ad sensum* construed as masculine; hence the form יִשְׂגֶּה (comp. Ewald, § 174 *e*), instead of which Olshausen unnecessarily proposes to read יַשְׂגֶּה, with אֵל as subject.

3. *Second Division:* A reference to the wise teachings of the ancients touching the merited end of those who forget God. ["In respect of its artistic, flowery, and yet concise style" (as well as in respect of the searching practical character of its contents), "this passage forms the climax of the whole discourse." Ewald.]

First Strophe: Vers. 8-10. Praise of the wisdom of the ancients, by way of introduction to the express testimonies of that wisdom which follows.

Ver. 8. **Inquire, I pray, of the former generation.**—As to the challenge in general, compare Deut. xxxii. 7. For שׁאל with לְ, see 2 Kings viii. 6; for the orthographical form רִישׁוֹן instead of רִאשׁוֹן, see below, ch. xxxix. 9 (רים instead of ראם). Whether the indefinite expression דּוֹר רִישׁוֹן be rendered by the singular, as above, or by the plural—"former generations"—is a matter of indifference. In any case no particular generation of the past is intended, as appears also from the following expression—"their fathers," (*i. e.*, the fathers of those former generations).—**And give heed to the research of their fathers**: *i. e.*, to that which their fathers had investigated and learned, to the experimental wisdom therefore of the fathers reaching back into the remotest antiquity.—חֵקֶר, research (ch. v. 9; ix. 10; xxxiv. 24), here in the sense of the object, or the results of research, that which is searched out. With וְכוֹנֵן supply לִבְּךָ, which is elsewhere put in connection with the Hiphil. Olshausen's emendation בּוֹנֵן, suggested by Deut. xxxii. 10, is unnecessary.

Ver. 9. **For we are of yesterday, and know nothing.**—This is the reason why we should hold to the tradition of the ancients. Lit., "we are yesterday," *i. e.*, of, or belonging to yesterday (תְּמוֹל = אַנְשֵׁי תְמוֹל, Ewald, § 296, *d*). The stress here laid on the ephemeral character of the present generation is then in the second member illustrated and strengthened by the figure of a *shadow* (צֵל); comp. ch. xiv. 2; Ps. cii. 12 (11); cix. 23; Eccles. vi. 12; viii. 13, also the Greek phrase σκιᾶς ὄναρ ἄνθρωπος (Pindar, Pyth. 8, 99; comp. Sophocles, Aj. 126, 1236; *Ant.* 1155; Euripides, *Med.* 1224, *etc.*) This fact, that the life of men is so perishable and short is the reason for the demand here made that we should apply ourselves to the wisdom of the ancients, the term of a single human life being insufficient to fathom the eternal laws which rule the universe; to ascertain these we must consult the collective experience of humanity throughout the past. There is no specific proof that the author here had in mind the remote generations of the primeval world, to wit, the macrobiotic races of the ante-diluvian period.

Ver. 10. **Will not they teach thee** [הֵם emphatic], **say to thee** [אָמַר, "say," rather than דבר "speak," because their words are cited in the verses following], **and bring forth words out of their heart?**—The heart is mentioned here as the seat of understanding and reflection, in contrast with Job's expressions, as the mere empty products of the lips (ver. 2; ch. xi. 2; xv. 3, *etc.;* comp. אִישׁ לֵבָב (ch. xxxiv. 10, 34), "a man of heart," *i e.*, of understanding. In regard to יוֹצִאוּ, *proment, proferent* (Vulg.), comp. Matth. xiii. 52.

Second Strophe: Vers. 11-13. First specimen, as reported by Bildad, of the wise teachings of the ancients, not indeed cited verbally, but still reproduced freely, and in exact accordance with the sense. [This introduction of the proverbial wisdom of antiquity in Bildad's discourse is a masterly stroke of art, worthy of especial note (1) Because of the new and interesting element which it contributes to the *rhetorical variety* of the book. (2). Because of its significance as a feature in our author's *dramatic portraiture of character*, Bildad being here presented to us as the disciple of tradition, the "proverbial philosopher," in contrast with the more mystically inclined Eliphaz, and the more dogmatic and self-assertive Zophar. (3). Because of the contribution thus furnished to the *material* of the book, to the discussion of its great problem, Bildad here furnishing to this discussion the voice of tradition, even as Eliphaz had furnished the voice of the supernatural world. See below Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks, No. 1.—E.].

Ver. 11. **Does the rush grow up without mire** [or, **except in the marsh**] **?**—גֹּמֶא, according to the Hebr. etymology from גמא, to swallow, absorb, *fistula bibere* (comp. ch. xxxix. 24; Gen. xxiv. 17), but also at the same time an Egyptian word (Copt. kam, cham, reed), denotes here, as in Ex. ii. 3; Is. xviii. 2; xxxv. 7, the Egyptian papyrus reed, which grows in the marshes of the Nile, but which, according to Theophrast, grows also in Palestine, the papyrus-shrub (*Cyperus papyrus L.*). The mention of this Egyptian product does not constitute a conclusive argument for the composition of the poem in Egypt, or by a poet of Egyptian origin, and all the less that Bildad is here only quoting the words of another and an older sage. Comp. Introd. § 7, *c.* [" Bildad likens the deceitful ground on which the prosperity of the godless stands to the dry ground on which, only for a time, the papyrus or reed finds water, and grows up rapidly; shooting up quickly, it withers as quickly; as the papyrus plant, if it has no perpetual water, though the finest of grasses, withers off when most luxuriantly green, before it attains maturity." DELITZSCH; see also Smith's Bib. Dic., Art. "Reed"]. **Does the reed-grass thrive without water?** אָחוּ reads in the Egyptian Greek of the LXX. (Is. xix. 7), and of the Book of Sirach (ch. xl. 16) ἄχι, and, as Jerome learned from the Egyptians, signifies in their language *omne quod in palude virens nascitur*, hence the grass of the Nile-marshes, seed-grass, Nile-grass (Copt. ake, oke=*calamus, juncus*). Instead of בְּלֹא of the first member, we have here בְּלִי, in the sense of "without;" for the former comp. ch. xxx. 28; for the latter ch. xxiv. 10; xxxi. 39; xxxiii. 9, *etc.* [בלי is properly constr. st. of noun, failure, lack.] Of the two synonymous verbs, יִגְאֶה in the first member signifies a "shooting up on high," an expression suitable to the size of the papyrus, which grows to the height of ten feet; יִשְׂגֶּא (another form of יִשְׂגֶּה, ver. 7; comp. Gesen. § 75, Rem. 21 [§ 74, Rem. 22]), in the second member, a luxuriant out-spreading growth, an expression suitable to the nature of the marsh-grass.

Ver. 12. **While yet** (it is) **in its greenness** (Cant. vi. 11) **is not cut down**: lit. "is not to be mowed down, not to be cut down," a circumstantial clause ["a proper Imperf., in a state of not cut, *un*-cut." DAV.] comp. Ewald, § 341, *b*.—**Then, sooner than all grass must it dry up**: because, namely, the condition of its existence, water, is all at once withdrawn, so that now it decays and withers sooner than common grass. As parallels in thought, comp. ch. v. 3; Matth. vi. 30.

Ver. 13. **So are the ways of all who forget God.**—A closing application of the comparison precisely similar to that in Prov. i. 19, where also the expression "ways" is used of what happens to men, their fate (comp. also Ps. i. 6; Job xxiii. 10; Wisd. v. 7, and often). For שֹׁכְחֵי אֵל as a synonym of רְשָׁעִים, the ungodly, comp. *e. g.* Ps. ix. 18 (17); l. 22. **And the hope of the ungodly perisheth**: comp. Prov. x. 28. חָנֵף as in ch. xiii. 16; xv. 34; xx. 5, and often. [In all these passages, and wherever the word occurs, the Eng. Ver. renders חָנֵף "hypocrite," which is altogether incorrect, the idea of dissimulation not belonging to the word at all. This rendering is the more strange, seeing that the cognate verb is always correctly rendered to be polluted, profane, corrupt, *etc.* —E.] Dillmann correctly calls attention to the fact that the figure of the reeds and grass of the marshes perishing by the sudden drying up of the water is intended to illustrate, not the judgment which will visit those who have always been ungodly, but only those who were at one time righteous, and therefore prosperous, but who afterwards fall away from God. In so far the description conveys a somewhat different thought from that in ch. v. 3.

Third and Fourth Strophes: vers. 14–19. A further description of the judgment of God upon the wicked, founded on the proverbial wisdom of the ancients.

Ver. 14. **He whose confidence is cut asunder.**—אֲשֶׁר as in ch. v. 5, an independent rel. pron., connecting the verse with what goes before; not a causal particle: *quippe, quoniam* (Del.). יָקוֹט is hardly a substantive, either of the signification "gourd" (Reiske, Hahn) or "gossamer" (Saadia, in Ewald-Dukes, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der ält. Auslegung*, I., 89). [Fürst and Hengstenberg prefer regarding it as a noun, meaning "that which is to be rejected."] Both as to the form and substance of the word, the only justifiable construction of it is as a Kal Imperf., deriving it either from קוּט=קוּץ, *fastidire* (Vulg. and many of the ancients, also Schultens), or with the Pesh., Chald., Kimchi, Rosenm., Gesen., and most of the moderns, from a verb קטט (=קצץ), "to cut off" (he, whose hope is cut off, *cujus spes succiditur*); or, which may be still more correct, from קוט, not elsewhere to be met with, and meaning "to cut, to be brittle, to break asunder," and so treating it as an intransitive verb, rather than as Kal Imperf. with a passive signification [comp. Ewald, § 138, *b*].—**And his trust is a spider's house**: *i. e.* that in which he trusts (מִבְטַחוֹ, *sensu obj.*, of the object of the trust), proves itself to be as perishable as a spider's web, which the slightest touch, or a mere puff of wind can destroy. For this figure comp. Is. lix. 5, also the Koran, Sur. xxix. 40, and the Arabic proverb quoted by Schultens, Umbreit, *etc.*: "Time destroys the wall of the skillfully built castle, even as the house of the spider is destroyed."

Ver. 15. More specific expansion of ver. 14 *b*. **He leaneth on his house**—as the object of his confidence, like the man spoken of in Schiller's *Bell*: "*Fest wie der Erde Grund*," *etc.* Comp. on Dan. iv. 26. [**But it stands not; he holds fast to it, but it endures not.** There is a certain gradation of thought in the verse. The ungodly first leans, stays himself on his house, but it gives way beneath him; finding this to be the case, feeling his trust giving way beneath him, he strengthens his

hold on it (יַחֲזִיק), grasps it with all his might, as a sinking man seizes violently on anything within his reach; but in vain! He and his hope all tumble to ruin together.—E.]

Ver. 16 sq. After thus dwelling briefly (vers. 14, 15) on the comparison of a falling house, the description now returns to the previous figure derived from the vegetable kingdom. For the marsh-reed, however, there is substituted the climbing plant, with its high and luxuriant growth; and the comparison is so presented that between the figure and the thing figured there is no sharp line of distinction observed, but each blends with the other.

Ver. 16. **Green is he** (the חָנֵף of ver. 13, who is here conceived of as a climbing plant) **in the sunshine**: in the same heat which causes other plants to wither.—**And his sprouts run over his garden** (יֹנַקְתּוֹ ["his suckers"] as in ch. xiv. 7; xv. 30): *i. e.* the whole garden in which he, this luxuriantly growing, creeping plant, is placed, is filled and over-run with his root-sprouts which cling to all about them.

Ver. 17. **His roots entwine themselves** (lit. are entwined) **over heaps of stone; he looks upon a house of stone**: in the sense, that is, that having grown up on it, he eagerly clings to it, as to a firm support. ["On יחזה Coccejus remarks: *non timet locum lapidosum, sed imperterritus videt.* He gazes on it boldly and confidently, with the purpose of making his home in it." HENGST.] By this is naturally to be understood a real stone house, its walls being of this material (comp. Gen. xlix. 22, according to the correct explanation of modern commentators), not anything figurative: *e. g.* the solid structure of his fortune, as Delitzsch explains it. Several modern commentators (Böttcher, Ewald, Stickel, Fürst, Dillmann) take בֵּית=בֵּין (as in Prov. viii. 2), hence in the sense of "between, in the midst of," and חזה, according to its primary signification, in the sense of: "to pierce through, to split between;" hence: "to pierce through between the stones," *viz.* with its roots. Possible, but perhaps too artificial. [The LXX. translate: ἐν μέσῳ χαλίκων ζήσεται, taking בית in the sense of בין, and evidently reading or substituting יחיה for יחזה. Gesenius regards חזה here as a bold metaphor, seeing the stones, for feeling them with the roots. Noyes and Renan regard the expression as describing the depth at which the plant takes root. The latter's rendering is: "His roots are intertwined at the rock; he touches the region of the granite." Wordsworth's comment is interesting: "*He surveyeth a house of stones;* he is like a tree which seems firmly rooted in a heap of stones, and *looks down*, as it were, with a domineering aspect, and a proud consciousness of strength *on a house of stone*, in which he appears to be firmly built, as in a marble palace; and yet he will soon be withered and rooted up, and vanish from the face of the earth.—Observe the order of the comparison. The sinner had been first likened to a plant of papyrus or reed-grass, with its tall green stem and flowery tuft flourishing in the watery slime, but suddenly withered, when the soil in which it is set is dried up: he is next compared to a shrub sprouting with fresh leaves, and shooting forth its luxuriant branches, mantling over the wall of the garden; and lastly he is likened to something still more robust, to a tree striking its roots downwards into a cairn of stones, and looking down with proud confidence on its house of rock, and seeming to defy the storm." We scarcely seem justified, however, in assuming a different plant or tree to be intended in ver. 17 from that described in ver. 16.—Conant thinks that "the explanation long ago given by Olympiodorus is the true one; *viz.* that the wicked is here likened to a plant springing up in a stony soil, and perishing for lack of depth of earth:" to which Davidson justly replies that "the stones assist, not impede the growth of this kind of plants, and ver. 17 is still occupied with the detail of the luxuriance of the plant."—We are thus led back to the view of Zöckler, Schlottm., Hengst., *etc.*, as on the whole the simplest and best; that both verses describe the same plant, ver. 16 as overrunning the garden with its creepers, ver. 17 as clinging stoutly to its house of stone.—E.]

Ver. 18. **If He destroys it from its place.**—The subj. in יְבַלְּעֶנּוּ (comp. the same verb in ch. ii. 3) is either to be left indefinite: "if one destroys him from his place [as if he is destroyed]," Umbreit, *etc.;* or, which is better suited to the poet's whole style and mode of thought, God is to be understood as the subject. On the contrary, in the second member: **It shall deny him: I have never seen thee**], the subject to be supplied with the verb is unquestionably: "his place" (מְקוֹמוֹ). It is a highly poetical conception which is here presented: the native ground, or the place of growth of an uprooted tree, *i. e.* of a transgressor cast down from the height of his prosperity, being, as it were, ashamed of him, denying him and refusing to know anything more of him.

Ver. 19. **Behold this is the joy** [ironically said] **of his way**: *i. e.* so does it end, his pretended joyful way of living (comp. on ver. 13); so sudden, calamitous is the end of his course. **And out of the dust shall others sprout up.**—"Others" (אַחֵר collect., comp. Ewald, § 319, *a*), *i. e.* other men blessed with external prosperity, whose happiness will either prove more enduring, or, in case they too fall away from God, will as surely crumble away as his.

Third Division and Fifth Strophe: Application of the wisdom of the ancients, as just cited, to the case of Job: vers. 20–22. [The picture just given suggested a solemn warning to Job to beware of incurring such a fate. Bildad, however, instead of giving to the application this minatory turn, uses a milder and more conciliatory tone, encouraging Job to repentance, by promises of the divine favor.—E.]

Ver. 20. **Behold, God despiseth not the pious man, and grasps not the hand of evil-doers**: *i. e.* in order to help and support them; comp Is. xli. 13; xlii. 6; Ps. lxxiii. 23; as also the figurative expansion of this truth just given ver. 12 sq.

Ver. 21. [Expanding, with personal application, the thought of ver. 20 *a*].—**While He**

will fill thy mouth with laughter, and thy lips with rejoicing.—Delitzsch (referring to ch. i. 18; Ps. cxli. 10) rightly interprets עַד at the beginning of this verse in the sense of "while," and takes the whole verse as the protasis of which ver. 22 is the apodosis. Others take עַד in the less suitable sense of "yea even" (Umbreit), or amend to עוֹד, "yet," comparing the passage with Ps. xlii. 6 (Cocceius, Houbigant, Böttcher, Ewald, Stickel, Dillmann). For the expression: "to fill any one's mouth with laughter," comp. Ps. cxxvi. 2; for the text יְמַלֵּה, instead of יְמַלֵּא (the case being accordingly the reverse of that in ver. 11, *b*), comp. Gesenius, § 75 [§ 74], 21, *b*.

Ver. 22. [Expansion of 20 *b*, with personal application to Job's enemies.]—**They that hate thee shall be clothed in shame**: the same comparison in Ps. xxxv. 26; cix. 29; cxxxii. 18. Observe how persuasive and conciliatory is this conclusion of Bildad's discourse, in that he wishes for the "haters" of Job the worst fate, the portion of the ungodly; thus unmistakably separating himself and his friends from that class, and placing himself decidedly on the side of Job.—**And the tent of the wicked—it is no more.**—For the use of the term "tent" as a concrete expression for the totality of well-being, comp. v. 24. Altogether too artificial is the explanation of Dillmann and others, denying the identity of the "wicked" with the "haters" in the first member, thus rendering the ו at the beginning of this member adversatively: "but the tent of the wicked is no more," as though Ps. i. 6 were a parallel passage, and the whole discourse of Bildad, notwithstanding the milder tone assumed in the last strophe, should still close with a warning or a threat. That this is in truth the case, only indirectly (*i. e.* in so far as the whole of ver. 22 dwells on the miserable lot of the wicked, without recurring to the description of Job's prosperity, and closing with that), see in the Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks, No. 3.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The similarity of this first discourse of Bildad to that of Eliphaz is so marked that it can almost be termed an abbreviated repetition, differing considerably in the application of several particulars, of that with which Eliphaz had already charged Job. The same censorious introduction and the same mitigating and conciliatory close! And in the body of the discourse the same exhortation to betake himself to God in penitence and in prayer for help, with the accompanying promise of salvation (comp. ver. 5 seq. with chap v. 8 seq.); the same figurative vesture frequently for one and the same truth, as, in particular, the description, twice occurring (ver. 12 and ver. 18), of the sudden withering and perishing of a plant of luxuriant growth, an unmistakable copy of the description first given by Eliphaz in chap. v. 3 seq. Another noteworthy point of similarity between the two discourses is that Eliphaz, in order more vividly to set forth and more forcibly to emphasize the central thought which he inculcates, presents the same in the form of a divine revelation brought to him mysteriously by night, while Bildad seeks to accomplish the same result by introducing the ancient teachers of wisdom as speaking, in place of himself (comp. ver. 8 seq. with chap. iv. 12 seq.). In this citation from the traditional Chokmah he gives a free reproduction of the same, in like manner as Eliphaz in his account of the vision had furnished an ideal, poetic picture. ["It was a hard stroke on Job to see not only his friends of the present, but all good and wise men of the past, marshalled against him; and tremendous must have been his force of conscience to resist and drive from the field such outnumbering odds." DAVIDSON. "It is a very important point which Bildad here makes. There is no surer way of falling into error than for one individual or one age wilfully and proudly to cut loose from its connection with the whole, and to resolve to be wise independently and alone. That is historical rationalism, of which that which is commonly called rationalism is but one species. The witness of tradition indeed is to be received *cum grano salis*—and at this point the friends are at fault. Something more is required than a correct understanding; the truth transmitted by historic tradition always has aspects which have not yet been completely developed; it is not enough to bring forward the whole—we must also, when new problems present themselves, be prepared to build up the New on the basis of the Old. That was the point where Elihu had the advantage over the friends." HENGSTENBERG.] It seems accordingly as though the poet had purposed to put Bildad forward as simply an imitator of Eliphaz, destitute of independence, and to present his continuation of the discussion of the latter as a weaker reproduction of the same, his object being thus to cast into the shade and to subordinate the spiritual significance of the friends and their position as compared with that of Job.

2. At the same time, however, this discourse is not wanting in new thoughts, which show that it aims to attack Job from another side than that chosen by his former critic. Eliphaz had argued against Job from the doctrine, derived from experience, of the absolute universality of human sinfulness. Bildad strenuously maintains against him *the inexorable justice of God*, who does not let the sinner go unpunished, nor the righteous unrewarded. His fundamental thought is presented in ver. 3: "Will God pervert the right, or the Almighty pervert justice?" or, as it is somewhat differently conceived, and with a particular application to Job's case in ver. 20: "Behold, God does not spurn the godly, nor take fast hold of (lend support to) the hand of evil-doers." The entire discourse is devoted to the discussion of this proposition, that the immutability of God's justice (His *justitia judicialis, tam remuneratoria quam punitiva*) is demonstrated alike in its treatment of the evil and of the godly. Every part of the discourse aims to establish this—the admonitory reference to the punishment inflicted on Job's children (ver. 4), the exhortation to him to beseech God for help and reconciliation (ver. 5 seq.), the striking illustrations given of the perishableness of the prosperity of him who forgets God (ver. 11 seq.), and the con-

cluding promise of happiness to him, if (as Bildad hopefully assumes he will do) he will repent and return to God (ver. 21 seq.). Like Eliphaz, or indeed in still higher measure than he, Bildad seems, in all that he says on these points, to establish himself entirely on the truth. There seems to be scarcely any thing in his words unscriptural, partial, or at all censurable. On the objective side, that which relates to the righteousness of God's treatment, his words seem as little liable to the charge of a one-sided narrowness, as on the subjective side, or that which sums up the case for Job, they are liable to that of inconsiderateness or unloving harshness.

3. That this, however, is only on the surface is evident from the painful venomous dart which at the very beginning almost of his discourse he aims at the heart of Job in the harsh judgment which he pronounces on his children, in the assertion, hypothetic indeed in form, but direct in its application, that their sudden death was the consequence of their sin, the merited punishment of their crime. At the bottom of this assertion there lies unquestionably *a one-sidedly harsh, gross and external representation of the nature and operations of God's retributive justice.* He is evidently entangled in the short-sighted doctrine of retribution which prevailed in antiquity, both within the theocracy, and in general in the monotheistic oriental world. He imagines that he is able, by means of the common-places formally stated in vers. 2 and 20 to solve all the riddles of life. Hence the self-righteous, Pharisaic condition to which he subjects the saving efficacy of Job's penitent supplication to God: "*if* thou (*i. e.*, provided thou) art pure and righteous" (ver. 6)—back of which we see clearly enough the implied thought: if thou art *not* righteous, all thy praying and beseeching is of no avail! Hence still further the malicious indirect attack on Job which is conveyed by the wise teachings of the ancients (ver. 11 seq.) respecting the sudden destruction of the man who forgets God! It would seem as though by these descriptions of the sudden withering and perishing of the Nile-reed, and of the destruction and uprooting of the thriving climbing-plant, Job's fall from the height of his former prosperity was pictured. We can imagine that it is in Bildad's thought to exclaim to his friend, like Daniel to king Nebuchadnezzar, "The tree . . . it is thou, O king!" (Dan. iv. 17 [20] seq.). Even the practical application at the close of the discourse, with its prediction of prosperity, has imparted to it by all this a flavor of bitterness to him who is addressed, especially seeing that the last words of the speaker dwell on the certain destruction, and the inevitable punishment, which the wicked incur, as though the stern moralizer must perforce repeatedly relapse out of the tone of promise into that of censure and menace (comp. on ver. 22). The fundamental error in Bildad's argument lies in a rigidly legal interpretation of the idea of justice, unmodified by a single softening ray from an evangelical experience of salvation and of the merciful love of God as Father—a representation of the nature of divine justice which is directly opposed to the proper sense of צֶדֶק, צְדָקָה (terms which denote the divine activity only as conditioned and ruled by God's holiness, or holy love). It is by this error that all that is harsh and one-sided in his discourse is to be explained. He knows nothing of a God disciplining and proving men in love, as a father his children. All human suffering he regards as simply and solely an infliction of God's retributive justice, which begins to punish when man turns away from God, and abates the suffering only when he returns to him again. "If Bildad had represented Job's suffering as a chastisement of divine love, which was to humble him in order the more to exalt him, Job would then have been constrained to humble himself, although Bildad might not have been altogether in the right. But Bildad, still further than Eliphaz from weakening the erroneous supposition of a hostile God which had taken possession of Job's mind, represents God's justice, to which he attributes the death of his children, instead of His love, as the hand under which Job is to humble himself. Thereby the comfort which Job's friend offers to him becomes a torture, and his trial is made still greater; for his conscience does not accuse him of any sins for which he should now have an angry instead of a gracious God." (Del.)

4. Notwithstanding these one-sided and erroneous characteristics, the present discourse furnishes to the practical expositors *something more* than material for criticism from the stand-point of the New Testament faith and religious consciousness. What it says in vindication of the righteous dealings of God, is in itself considered, and especially in contrast with Job's unseemly and passionate complaints, well grounded and unassailable. We might just as well find a difficulty with descriptions of the righteous administration of the world similar to this, such as are found in the Psalms (Ps. i.; Ps. vii.; Ps. xviii. 21 [20] seq.; Ps. xxxiv. 13 [12] seq.), and find in them nothing but expressions of religious perversity, and of an unevangelical way of thinking and acting; and yet such a view of those expressions, occurring as they do in quite another connection, would be entirely without foundation. The poetic beauty, moreover, of the illustrations of the miserable lot of the wicked in ver. 11 seq. would lose all value if we were to apply this one-sided critical standard to the discourse, and to consider it *only* as the expression of a disposition of hypocritical work-righteousness. This the homiletic expositor is evidently not bound to do. Besides those one-sided and harsh features of the discourse, he may and should give prominence also to that which is eternally true and beautiful in it, as an inspired eulogy of the righteous intervention of the Godhead in the destinies of mankind. And—a point which in particular is not to be overlooked—he must bear in mind that, as is shown by the wise sayings of the ancients, quoted by Bildad from a gray antiquity, the knowledge which experience brings of God's retributive justice as visibly exercised in this world was possessed by the pious of our race even in the earliest times; and still further—that for this knowledge of God's holy and righteous ordering of the world—a knowledge which is deeply impressed on the universal consciousness of mankind, and which is kept fresh and vivid by great

historical examples, such as the histories of Noah and his contemporaries, of Abraham and Lot, of Joseph, Moses, Korah, Balaam, *etc.*—the only foundation which can be assumed as underlying all else is a positive original revelation in the beginning of humanity's history.—And this is what determines the value and applicability of the following selections from practical exegetes of the past, which are here given as

Homiletic and Practical Remarks on Single Passages.

Vers. 3, 4. BRENTIUS: Such as do not understand the glory of God's Gospel, but are unwisely carried away by zeal for the Law, say: the way of the Lord is not just, because He forgets the wickedness of him who repents, and the goodness of him who relapses into sin—whereas, according to what is decreed in the Law, evil is to be punished and good rewarded. But they hear it said again: I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, saith the Lord God; return ye, and live, and all your sins shall be forgotten. —ZELTNER: Nothing is easier or more common with the world than by a precipitate judgment to sin against one's neighbor in respect to his misfortunes, especially when believers are concerned. . . . . Although God visits the iniquity of fathers on their children, the calamities which befall pious children are nevertheless no proof that they or their parents have sinned (John ix. 3).

Ver. 8 seq. COCCEIUS: There is no doubt but that fathers ought to transmit the revelations which they have received from God to their children and to other men; and that, moreover, through God's blessing, the truth has been preserved for a time among some through such tradition; although the conjecture is not improbable that our fathers (from the time of Moses on) delivered much to writing.—BRENTIUS: Our life, as its origin was most recent, so is its end most swift; so that some one has well said: Man is a bubble, which having suddenly arisen on the face of the water, soon perishes. Seeing then that our life is most short, prudence in the management of affairs should be learned from those who are older, and from our ancestors; for the authority of the aged is sacred and venerable.

Vers. 11-19. STARKE (according to the *Weim. Bib.*): The hope of hypocrites is perishable; for it is founded not on God, but only on that which is temporal and perishable (Ps. xxxvii. 35 seq.; xlix. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 31; 1 John ii. 17).—WOHLFARTH: The prosperity of the ungodly is *only apparent:* so teaches the wisdom of the ancients, so preaches the Holy Scripture, so testifies experience, so proves the nature of things. For the happiness of sin is neither real, nor satisfactory, nor enduring. The peace which makes us truly happy is not dependent on external possessions.—VICT. ANDREAE: The wise proverbs of antiquity, to which Bildad (with affected humility) refers Job, are intended to teach the latter that as there are no reeds without a marsh, so also Job's calamity in strict propriety could proceed only out of his great wickedness; wherefore Job must not wonder at it; nay, his confidence in his good conscience would be a treacherous support, as he will soon enough find to his cost.

Ver. 20 seq. BRENTIUS: Although the ungodly may seem to flourish and to be blessed in this world, they are nevertheless exposed to the curse, which in its own time is revealed. And as the ungodly now behold the afflictions of the godly in this world with the greatest rejoicing of soul, so again in God's judgment day they will be the laughing-stock of all creatures, and will be confounded before them: Is. lxvi.—COCCEIUS (on ver. 20): From hence it is apparent that it happens to the ungodly as to the papyrus and sedge; to the godly as to an herb that is transplanted. The justice of God cannot therefore be accused; as though it would not reward each one according to his way of living. For although the papyrus and the grass are attached to the water, they do nevertheless dry up. And although a good herb may be dug out, it is nevertheless planted anew elsewhere with a great increase of fertility and utility. A measure of happiness for the ungodly does not dishonor God's justice; trusting in their happiness they are brought to shame and confusion; neither is it dishonored by the affliction of the righteous, which is for their good.—ZELTNER: Just as the suffering of the godly is no proof that they have been rejected by God, so also the brilliant prosperity of the ungodly is no proof that they are in God's favor. But God permits such things to happen in order to test His people's patience, faith and hope, and, at the right time, to save them and make them happy forever. Therefore, my Christian brother, continue pious, and keep in the right (Ps. xxxvii. 37).

B.—Job's reply: Assertion of his innocence and a mournful description of the incomprehensibleness of his suffering as a dark horrible destiny.

Chapters IX—X.

1. God is certainly the Almighty and Ever-Righteous One, who is to be feared; but His power is too terrible for mortal man:

Ch. IX. 2–12.

1 Then Job answered and said,

2 I know it is so of a truth:
but how should man be just with God?
3 If he will contend with Him,
he cannot answer Him one of a thousand.
4 He is wise in heart, and mighty in strength;
who hath hardened himself against Him, and hath prospered?

5 Which removeth the mountains, and they know not:
which overturneth them in His anger;
6 which shaketh the earth out of her place,
and the pillars thereof tremble;
7 which commandeth the sun, and it riseth not;
and sealeth up the stars;

8 Which alone spreadeth out the heaven,
and treadeth upon the waves of the sea;
9 which maketh Arcturus, Orion, and Pleiades,
and the chambers of the South;
10 which doeth great things, past finding out;
yea, and wonders without number.

11 Lo, He goeth by me, and I see Him not;
He passeth on also, but I perceive Him not.
12 Behold, He taketh away, who can hinder Him?
who will say unto Him, What doest Thou?

2. The oppressive effect of this Omnipotence and Arbitrariness of God impels him, as an innocent sufferer, to presumptuous speeches against God:

Verses 13–35.

13 If God will not withdraw His anger,
the proud helpers do stoop under Him.
14 How much less shall I answer Him,
and choose out my words to reason with Him?
15 Whom, though I were righteous, yet would I not answer,
but I would make supplication to my judge.
16 If I had called, and He had answered me,
yet would I not believe that He had hearkened to my voice.

17 For He breaketh me with a tempest,
and multiplieth my wounds without cause.
18 He will not suffer me to take my breath,
but filleth me with bitterness.
19 If I speak of strength—lo, He is strong!
and if of judgment, who shall set me a time to plead?

20 If I justify myself, mine own mouth shall condemn me;
If I say, I am perfect, it shall also prove me perverse.

21 Though I were perfect, yet would I not know my soul;
I would despise my life.
22 This is one thing, therefore I said it,
He destroyeth the perfect and the wicked.
23 If the scourge slay suddenly,
He will laugh at the trial of the innocent.
24 The earth is given into the hand of the wicked:
He covereth the faces of the judges thereof;
if not, where, and who is He?

25 Now my days are swifter than a post;
they flee away, they see no good.
26 They are past away as the swift ships;
as the eagle that hasteth to the prey.
27 If I say, I will forget my complaint,
I will leave off my heaviness, and comfort myself;
28 I am afraid of all my sorrows,
I know that Thou wilt not hold me innocent.

29 If I be wicked,
Why then labor I in vain?
30 If I wash myself with snow water,
and make my hands never so clean,
31 yet shalt Thou plunge me in the ditch,
and mine own clothes shall abhor me.

32 For He is not a man, as I am, that I should answer Him,
and we should come together in judgment.
33 Neither is there any daysman betwixt us,
that might lay his hand upon us both.
34 Let Him take His rod away from me,
and let not His fear terrify me;
35 then would I speak, and not fear Him;
but it is not so with me.

3. A plaintive description of the merciless severity with which God rages against him, although as an Omniscient Being, He knows that he is innocent:

CHAPTER X. 1-22.

1 My soul is weary of my life;
I will leave my complaint upon myself;
I will speak in the bitterness of my soul.

2 I will say unto God, Do not condemn me;
show me wherefore Thou contendest with me.
3 Is it good unto Thee, that Thou shouldest oppress,
that thou shouldest despise the work of Thine hands,
and shine upon the counsel of the wicked?
4 Hast Thou eyes of flesh?
or seest Thou as man seeth?
5 Are Thy days as the days of man?
are Thy years as man's days,
6 that Thou inquirest after mine iniquity,
and searchest after my sin?
7 Thou knowest that I am not wicked;
and there is none that can deliver out of Thy hand.

8 Thine hands have made me and fashioned me
together round about—yet Thou dost destroy me!
9 Remember, I beseech Thee, that Thou hast made me as the clay;
and wilt Thou bring me into dust again?
10 Hast Thou not poured me out as milk,
and curdled me as cheese?
11 Thou hast clothed me with skin and flesh,
and hast fenced me with bones and sinews.
12 Thou hast granted me life and favor,
and Thy visitation hath preserved my spirit.

13 And these things hast Thou hid in Thine heart;
I know that this is with Thee.
14 If I sin, then Thou markest me,
and Thou wilt not acquit me from mine iniquity.
15 If I be wicked, woe unto me!
and if I be righteous, yet will I not lift up my head:
I am full of confusion; therefore see Thou mine affliction.
16 For it increaseth. Thou hauntest me as a fierce lion:
and again Thou shewest Thyself marvellous upon me.
17 Thou renewest Thy witnesses against me,
and increasest Thine indignation upon me;
changes and war are against me.

18 Wherefore then hast Thou brought me forth out of the womb?
Oh that I had given up the ghost, and no eye had seen me!
19 I should have been as though I had not been;
I should have been carried from the womb to the grave.
20 Are not my days few? Cease then,
and let me alone, that I may take comfort a little,
21 before I go whence I shall not return,
even to the land of darkness, and the shadow of death;
22 a land of darkness, as darkness itself;
and of the shadow of death, without any order,
and where the light is as darkness!

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. As we have seen, Eliphaz and Bildad had alike made the attempt, on the basis of their common places, such as the fact of the universal sinfulness of men, and that of the invariable justice of God's dealings, to extort from Job the confession of His own ill-desert as the cause of his suffering. Neither of them had heeded his request to render a more reasonable and just decision concerning his case (ch. vi. 28-30). In this new reply accordingly he addresses himself to both at once, and maintains most emphatically, and even with impassioned vehemence that their propositions, true as they were in general, were not applicable to his case. These propositions which they advanced concerning God's unapproachable purity, and inexorable justice he admits, but only in order "satirically to twist them into a recognition of that which is for mortal man a crushing, overpowering omnipotence in God, disposing of him with an arbitrariness which admits of no reply" (ch. ix. 2-12). He then, in daring and presumptuous language, arraigns this terrible Being, this arbitrary Divine disposer, who, as he thinks, notwithstanding his innocence, is resolved to hold and treat him as guilty (ch ix. 13-35). And finally, under the influence of these gloomy reflections he falls back into his former strain of doubt and lamentation (in ch. 3), closing with a sentiment repeated verbally from that lamentation, although in a condensed form, and casting a gloomy look toward that Hereafter, which promises him nothing better, nothing but an endless prolongation of his present misery (ch. x. 1-22). [Dillmann calls attention to the fact that while in the former discourse Job had directed one entire section against his friends, here he says nothing formally against them, but soliloquizes, as it were in their hearing, leaving them to infer whither their assaults are driving him]. The first of these three tolerably long divisions embraces four short strophes (the first three consisting of three verses each, the last of two); the second division consists of two equal sub-divisions (vers. 13-24 and vers. 25-35) each of three strophes, and each strophe of four verses: the third division comprises, after an exordium of three lines (ch. x. 1) two double-strophes (vers. 2-12 and 13-22) the first formed of one strophe of 6, and one of 5 verses, the second of two strophes, each of five verses.

2. *First Division:* Job concedes the propositions of his opponents regarding God's immutable justice and absolute purity, but shows that for that very reason His power is all the more to be dreaded by mortals; ch. ix. 2-12.

First Strophe: Vers. 2-4. [Impossibility of maintaining one's cause before God].

Ver. 2. **Of a truth** [ironical as also in xii. 2] **I know that it is so,** *viz.*, that what Bildad has set forth is quite true: that God ever does only that which is right, and that whatever proceeds from him must for that very reason be right. It is only to this leading proposition of Bildad's discourse (ch. viii. 3) that Job's remark here can refer, and not also to the discourse of Eliphaz, to which reference is first made in the following member: [It seems hardly worth while to make this distinction between two members of the same verse. *Formally* it is more natural indeed to suppose the opening remark to be addressed to Bildad, *materially* it doubtless refers to both. "In his former reply to Eliphaz," says Hengstenberg, "he had sought to work rather on the feelings of his friends. Having failed in this, as the discourse of Bildad shows, he now makes all that the friends had spoken the subject of his criticism."]—**And how should a mortal** [אֱנוֹשׁ, man in his weakness and mortality] **be right before God?** *i. e.*, how should it be otherwise than as Eliphaz has declared in his fundamental proposition (ch. iv. 17), to wit, that "no man is just before God;" which proposition moreover Job here changes into one somewhat differing in sense: "no man is right before God."

Ver. 3. **Should he desire to contend with Him, he could not answer Him one of a thousand.**—The subject in both members of the verse is man, not God, as Schlottman, Delitzsch, Kamphausen, explain. By "contending" is meant seeking to establish by controversy or discussion the right of man which is denied. The meaning of the second member of the verse is, that God, as infinitely man's superior, would overwhelm him with such a multitude of questions that he must stand before Him in mute embarrassment and shame, as was actually the case at last with Job, when God began to speak (ch. xxxviii. 1 sq.).

Ver. 4. **The wise of heart and mighty in strength—who has braved Him and remained unhurt?**—The absolute cases חכם לב and אמיץ כח are resumed in אֵלָיו, and refer accordingly to God, and not to מִי (as Olshausen thinks). With הִקְשָׁה is to be supplied עֹרֶף: "who has hardened his neck against Him," (Deut. x. 16; 2 Kings. xvii. 14), *i. e.*, bid Him defiance?

Second Strophe: Vss. 5-7. A lofty poetic description of the irresistibleness of God's omnipotence, beginning with its *destructive* manifestations in nature. ["Job having once conceived the power of God becomes fascinated by the very tremendousness of it—the invincible might of his and man's adversary charms his eye and compels him to gaze and shudder, and run over it feature after feature, unable to withdraw his look from it. This alone, and not any superficial desire (Ewald) to emulate Eliphaz (to whom there is no particular reference in the speech as most comm. think), accounts for this piece of sublime picturing. Ewald has however finely remarked that the features Job fastens on are the dark and terror-inspiring, as was natural from the attitude in which he conceived God to stand to him." Davidson].

Ver. 5. **Who removeth mountains, and they are not aware that** (אֲשֶׁר as in Ex. xi. 7; Ezek. xx. 26) **He hath overturned them in His wrath.**—[In favor of thus regarding אֲשֶׁר as a conjunction rather than a relative, may be urged (1) The Perf. הָפַךְ, which would otherwise be Imperf.; comp. יַחְתֹּם ver. 7. (2). The introduction of a relative construction in a coordinate clause, and ו being absent would be a violation of the present participial construction of the strophe. The use of the Imperf. in 6 *b* and 7 *b* is different: those clauses being introduced by ו and subordinate.—E.]. The activity of the Divine wrath bursts upon them so quickly and suddenly that they are quite unconscious of the mighty change which has been effected in them.

Ver. 6. **Who maketh the earth to tremble out of her place:** *viz.*, by earthquakes, comp. Isa. xiii. 13; Ps. xlvi. 3 [2], 4 [3]; and touching the climactic advance from the mountains to the earth, see Ps. xc. 2.—**And her pillars are shaken** [lit., rock themselves. The fundamental meaning of פלץ, which is akin to פלס and פלשׁ, is as Dillmann says, to waver, to rock, not to break, as Ges. and Fürst explain, connecting it with פרץ]. The pillars of the earth (comp. Ps. lxxv. 4 [3]; civ. 5), are, according to the poetic representation prevalent in the O. T. the subterranean roots of her mountains [or according to Schlottmann the foundations on which the earth rests suspended over nothing: ch. xxvi. 7; xxxviii. 6], not their summits, lifted above the earth, which are rather (according to ch. xxvi. 11; comp. xxxviii. 6) to be thought of as the pillars of the heavenly vault, like Atlas in the Greek mythology.

Ver. 7. **Who bids the sun** (חֶרֶס, a rare poetic term for the sun, as in Isa. xix. 18; comp. חַרְסָה, Judg. xiv. 18) ["perhaps (says Delitz.), from the same root as חָרוּץ, one of the poetical names of gold," seeing that in Isaiah l. c. 'Ir ha-Heres is a play upon עִיר הַחֶרֶס, Ἡλιούπολις], **and it riseth not,** *i. e.*, so that it does not shine forth (comp. Isa. lviii. 10), and so appears eclipsed.—**And setteth a seal round about the stars,** seals them, *i. e.*, veils them behind thick clouds, so that through their obscuration the night is darkened in the same measure as the day by an eclipse of the sun. In regard to obscurations of the heavenly bodies in general as indications of the Divine Power manifesting itself in destruction and punishment, comp. Ex. x. 21; Joel iii. 4 (ii. 31); Ezek. xxxii. 7 seq.; Rev. vi. 12; xvi. 10.

Third Strophe: Vers. 8-10. The description of the Divine Omnipotence continued, more especially in respect to its *creative* operations in nature. [To be noted is the absence of the ar-

ticle with the participles in each of these three verses, which alike with its presence in each of the three preceding verses, is clearly a sign of the strophic arrangement.—E.]

Ver. 8. **Who spreadeth out the heavens alone.** נֹטֶה according to parallel passages, such as Isa. xl. 22; xliv. 24; Ps. civ. 2, where the heavenly vault is represented as an immense tent—canvass, is to be explained: "who stretcheth out, spreadeth out," not with Jerome, Ewald [Noyes, Davidson], *etc.*, "who bows down, lets down." With the latter interpretation the clause לְבַדּוֹ would not agree; nor again the contents of ver. 9, where clearly God's activity as Creator, not as Destroyer, or as one shaking the firmament and the stars, is more fully set forth.—**And treads upon the heights of the sea,** *i. e.*, upon the high-dashing waves of the sea agitated by a storm, over which God marches as its ruler and controller (ch. xxxviii. 10 sq.) with sure and majestic tread, as upon the heights of the earth, according to Amos iv. 13; Mic. i. 3; Comp. Hab. iii. 15, also the excellent translation of the passage before us in the Sept.: περιπατῶν ἐπὶ θαλάσσης ὡς ἐπ' ἐδάφους. Hirzel and Schlottmann [Merx] understand the reference to be to the waters of the firmament, the heavenly cloud-vessels, or thunder-clouds (Gen. i. 6 sq.; Ps. civ. 3; Ps. xviii. 12 (10); xxix. 3; Nah. i. 3). But these cloud-waters of the heavens are never elsewhere in the Holy Scripture called "sea" (יָם); also not in ch. xxxvi. 30 (see on the passage), and still less in Rev. iv. 6; xv. 22; xxii. 1, where the θάλασσα of glass in the heavenly world signifies something quite different from a sea of rain-clouds. ["The objection that this view of *sea* interferes with the harmony of description, mixing earth and heaven, is obviated by the consideration that the passage is a description of a storm where earth (sea) and heaven *are* mixed." Davidson].

Ver. 9. **Who createth the Bear and Orion and Pleiades.**—עֹשֶׂה is taken by Umbreit and Ewald as synonymous with עֹטֶה; "who darkens the Bear, *etc.*", against which however may be urged the use of עשה in ver. 10, likewise the description flowing out of the present passage in Am. v. 8, and finally the lack of evidence that עשה means *tegere* (which remark holds true also of ch. xv. 27; and xxiii. 9). Moreover the connection decidedly requires a verb of creating or making. ["This as well as all the other participles from ver. 5 on to be construed in the present, for the act of creation is conceived as continuous, renewing itself day by day." Dillmann.—"Job next describes God as the Creator of the stars, by introducing a constellation of the northern (the Bear), one of the southern (Orion), and one of the eastern sky (the Pleiades)." Delitzsch]. Of the three names of northern constellations, which occur together in ch. xxxviii. 31, 32, עָשׁ, or as it is written in that later passage עַיִשׁ, denotes unmistakably the Great Bear, or Charles's Wain, the *Septentrio* of the Romans, and the n'ash (נעש), *i. e.*, "bier" of the Arabians. Whether the word is etymologically related to this Arabic term, which is suggested by the resemblance of the square part of the constellation to a bier, the three trailing stars, the *benath na'ash*, "daughters of the bier," being imagined to be the mourners, is doubtful. [The current form עיש decisively contradicts the derivation from נעש] —כְּסִיל in that case, lit. "the fool," is certainly Orion, who, according to the almost universal representation of the ancient world, was conceived of as a presumptuous and foolhardy giant, chained to the sky; comp. the mention of the מוֹשְׁכוֹת, *i. e.*, the "bands," or "fetters" of Orion in ch. xxxviii. 31, as well as the accordant testimony of the ancient versions (LXX.: Ὠρίων, at least in the parallel passages ch. xxxviii. 31 and Isa. xiii. 10; similarly the Pesh., Targ., *etc.*). Against the reference to the star Canopus (Saad. Abulwalid, *etc.*), may be urged, apart from the high antiquity of the tradition which points to Orion, the context of the present passage as well as of ch. xxxviii. 31, and Am. v. 8, which indicates groups of stars, and not a single star.—The third constellation כִּימָה *i. e.*, the heap, is rendered "the Hyades" only in the Vulgate; the remaining ancient versions however (also Saadia), and the Vulg. itself in the parallel passage, xxxviii. 31, render by πλειάς, Pleiades, so that beyond doubt it is to be understood of the group of seven stars in the neck of Taurus (known in German as the "clucking hen"); comp. Am. v. 8.—**And the chambers of the South**; *i. e.*, the secret rooms or spaces (*penetralia*) of the constellations of the southern heavens, which to the inhabitant of the northern zones are visible only in part, or not at all. In any case תֵּמָן (defectively written for תֵּימָן) points to the southern heavens, and since חֲדָרִים predominantly signifies "apartments, chambers, halls," less frequently "store-rooms, reservoirs," the reference to the "reservoirs of the south wind" (LXX: ταμεῖα νότου; some modern interpreters also, as Ges., *etc.*) is less natural, especially as the description continues to treat of the objects of the southern skies. [Dillmann, after recognizing the rendering of the LXX. as admissible, remarks: "On the other side the author certainly knew nothing of the constellations of the southern hemisphere; at the same time as one who had travelled (or at least: as one familiar with the results attained in his day by the observation of physical phenomena,—E.) he might well be acquainted with the fact that the further South men travel, the more stars and constellations are visible in the heavens; these are to the man who lives in the North, secluded as it were in the inmost chambers of the heavenly pavilion, and are for that reason invisible; it is of these 'hidden spaces' (Hirzel) of the South, with their stars, that we are here to think"].

Ver. 10. **Who doeth great things, past finding out, and marvelous things without number**: agreeing almost *verbatim* with what Eliphaz had said previously, ch. v. 9, in describing the wondrous greatness of the Divine Power—an agreement, indeed, which is intentional, Job being determined to concede as fully

as possible the affirmations of his friends respecting this point.

Fourth Strophe: vers. 11, 12. God puts forth this irresistible omnipotence not only in nature, both in earth and in heaven, but also in that which befalls individual human lives, as Job himself had experienced.—["There is great skill in making Job touch merely the outstanding points, illuminate only with a single ray the heaven-reaching heights of the Divine power; that in itself is not his immediate theme—it is the crushing effect this power has on feeble man; and to this he hastens on with sudden strides." DAV. "After the extended description [just given] of the Divine omnipotence (which Ewald wrongly characterizes as "altogether too much of a digression," whereas it is entirely pertinent to the subject, and all that follows proceeds out of it), the short hasty glance which in this and the following verse is cast on miserable mortal man, makes an impression so much the more pointed." SCHLOTTMAN.]

Ver. 11. **Lo!** [הֵן in this and the following verse, vividly descriptive, and also strongly individualizing *himself* as the victim of the irresistible omnipotence just described] **He passes by me [and I see Him not; He sweeps before me, and I perceive Him not.**—The imperfect verb for present, "being an exclamation of felt, though unseen, nearness of God." DAV.—יחלף in ch. iv. 15 of "a spirit;" here of the Infinite Spirit, sweeping past him on His career of destruction.—E.] חלף, synonymous with עבר as in ch. iv. 15, forms an assonance with the parallel חתף of the following verse.

Ver. 12. **[Lo! He snatches away** (scil. His prey)], **who will hold Him back**; or: "turn Him back" (יְשִׁיבֶנּוּ), *viz.* from His course: hence equivalent to: "who will put himself as an obstacle in His way?" (comp. ch. xi. 10; xxiii. 13).

3. *Second Division:* The oppressive thought of God's overwhelming and arbitrary power incites him, the innocent sufferer, to speak defiantly against God: vers. 13-35.

First Section: vers. 13-24: A general complaint of the severity and arbitrariness with which God abuses the exercise of His illimitable omnipotence towards man.

First Strophe: vers. 13-16. [The mightiest cannot withstand Him, how much less I?]

Ver. 13. [By some put in strophic connection with the verses preceding; but ver. 12 appropriately closes the first division, while ver. 13 is the basis of what follows. Observe especially the contrast between the "helpers of Rahab" in 13 *b*, and "I" in 14 *a*.—E.]—**Eloah ceases not from His wrath** [Eng. Ver. incorrectly begins with "if"]: lit. "does not cause it to return," *i. e.* does not recall it ["it is as a storm wind sweeping all before it, or a mounting tide bearing down all resistance and strewing itself with wrecks." DAV.].—An affirmation the decided one-sidedness of which sufficiently appears from other passages, *e. g.*, from Ps. lxxviii. 38.—**The helpers of Rahab stoop under Him.**—So far as רַהַב in and of itself denotes only "a violent, insolent and stormy nature" (comp. ch. xxvi. 12), עֹזְרֵי־רַהַב may be simply rendered, as by Luther, Umbreit, and most of the older expositors: "insolent," or "proud helpers" [and so E. V., Con., Dav., Hengst.]. But apart from the colorless, tame signification which thus results [to which add the vague generality of the description, weakening the contrast between 13 *b* and 14 *a;* and the incompleteness of the expression, whether we translate, "proud helpers," which suggests the query—helpers of what? or "helpers of pride."—E.], the Perf. שָׁחֲחוּ, lit. "*have* stooped," leads us to conjecture a definite historical case ["a *case* of signal vengeance on some daring foe, who drew around him many daring *helpers*, would be more telling in this connection." DAV.] Moreover רהב in fact appears elsewhere in a more concrete sense than that of "violent, presumptuous raging" (so also in ch. xxvi. 12, where see Com.). It signifies, to wit, as Is. li. 9; Ps. lxxxix. 11 [10] show, essentially the same with תַּנִּין, hence a *sea-monster* (κῆτος), and by virtue of this signification is used as a mythological and symbolical designation of Egypt (as well in the two passages just mentioned, as also in Is. xxx. 7 and Ps. lxxxvii. 4), the same country which elsewhere also is symbolically designated as תַּנִּין or לִוְיָתָן. We are thus left to one of two significations for רהב in the present passage. We may, on the one hand, find in the passage a special reference to Egypt, and an allusion to some extraordinary event in the history of that country, whereby its rulers or allies were overwhelmed with defeat. In this case, it would be more natural with Hahn to think of the overthrow of Pharaoh and his mighty ones in the time of Moses [so Jarchi who understands by the "helpers" the guardian angels of the Egyptians, who came to their assistance, but were restrained by God], than with Olshausen to think of some unknown event in the history of Ancient Egypt, or even with Böttcher of the reign of Psammetich. Or, on the other hand, setting aside any special reference to Egypt, we can (with Ewald, Hirzel, Schlottmann, Delitzsch, Dillmann) regard it as an allusion to some legend, current among the nations of the East, according to which some gigantic sea-monster with its helpers was subdued by the Deity (comp. the Hindu myth of Indra's victory over the dusky demon Britras). In favor of this interpretation may be urged the parallel passage in ch. xxvi. 12, which certainly contains no reference to Egypt, as well as the rendering of the LXX., κήτη τὰ ὑπ' οὐρανόν, which evidently points to an old tradition of the correct interpretation. ["Jerome translates *qui portant orbem*, probably following a Jewish tradition concerning giants which had been overcome by God and sentenced to bear the pillars of the earth." SCHLOTT. Dillmann argues forcibly, that the common application of these three terms, רהב, תנין, and לויתן, to Egypt can be explained only by supposing that the first was related in signification to the other two names, being used

like them of a sea-monster. He further remarks: "that the legend was widely known and possessed great vitality among the people is indicated by the fact that poets and prophets used it as a symbol of the imperial power of Egypt. It is not strange, accordingly, to find such a popular legend used for his purpose by a poet who elsewhere also derives his material on all sides from popular conceptions."] Add that it is more natural to seek the basis of this legend of Rahab either in obscure reminiscences which lingered among the ancients touching the gigantic sea-monsters of the primitive world (plesiosauri, ichthyosauri, *etc.*), or in a symbolical representation of the billowy swelling of the raging ocean, resembling an infuriated monster, than to assign to it an astronomical basis, and to take רהב to be at the same time the name of a constellation such as Κῆτος or Πρίστις (*Balæna Pistrix*); for the context by no means points of necessity to such an astronomical application of the term (the mention of the constellations in ver. 9 being too remote), and moreover in ch. xxvi. 12 there is nothing of the kind indicated, as Dillmann correctly observes, against Ewald, Hirzel, Delitzsch.

Ver. 14. **How should I answer Him?**—I, an impotent, weak, sorely suffering mortal. On אַף כִּי comp. ch. iv. 19; on עָנָה, "to answer, respond," see above on ver. 3.—**Choose out my words against Him?** *i. e.* weigh my words against Him (עִם as in ch. x. 17; xi. 5; xvi. 21) with such care and skill [the ה in אֶבְחֲרָה indicating the mental effort involved], that I should always hit on the right expression, and thus escape all censure from Him.

Ver. 15. **Whom I** (even) **if I were in the right** (צָדַקְתִּי, *sensu forensi*) ["innocent, judicially free from blame"], **could not answer, I must make supplication to Him as my judge,** *viz.* for mercy (התחנן with לְ as in Esth. iv. 8). The Partic. Poel מְשֹׁפְטִ is not essentially different in signification from the Partic. Kal שֹׁפֵט, although it does differ somewhat from it, in so far as it denotes lit. an "assailant" or "adversary" (judicial opponent: שׁׂפֵט, [Poel, expressing aim, endeavor], *judicando vel litigando aliquem petere*, comp. Ewald, § 125, *a*). ["So overpowering is God's might that Job would be brought in litigating with Him to the humiliation of beseeching His very adversary—an idea which sufficiently answers Conant's charge, that to render מְשֹׁפְטִ *assailant* has very little point." Dav.]

Ver. 16. **Should I summon Him, and He answered me** (if accordingly the case supposed to be necessary in 15 *b* should actually happen, and be followed with results favorable to the suppliant), **I would not believe that He would listen to me:** *i. e.* I should not be able to repress the painful and awful thought that He, the heavenly and all-powerful Judge of the world, would grant me no hearing at all. ["The answer of God when summoned is represented in ver. 16 *a* as an actual result (*præt.* followed by *fut. consec.*), therefore ver. 16 *b* cannot be intended to express: I could not believe that he answers me, but: I could not believe that He, the answerer, would hearken to me; His infinite exaltation would not permit such exaltation." Delitzsch.] The whole verse is thus an advance in thought upon the preceding.

Second Strophe: Vers. 17–20. Continuing the description of Job's utter hopelessness of victory in his controversy with God, clothed in purely hypothetical statements.

Ver. 17. **He who would overwhelm me in a tempest, and multiply my wounds without cause;** *i. e.*, who would pursue me with assaults and calamities, even if I were innocent. [אֲשֶׁר may be taken either as relative, or as conj. "for," (E. V. Con.) the one meaning really blends with the other, as in ver. 15 = *quippe qui*]. With the rendering of יְשׁוּפֵנִי here adopted, "would overwhelm me" (so also Vaih.) we can leave unsolved the question, so difficult of decision, whether, following the Aram. שְׁפָא, and the testimony of the Ancient Versions (LXX. ἐκτρίψῃ; Vulg. *conteret*), we render שׁוּף "to crush, to grind;" or, following the Arab. sâfa, and the Hebr. שָׁאַף; we render it "to snatch up, seize," (*inhiare*). Hirzel, Ewald, Umbreit, Dillmann, favor the latter rendering; but on the other side Delitzsch successfully demonstrates that neither Gen. iii. 15 nor Ps. cxxxix. 11 (the only passages outside of the present in which שׁוּף appears) necessarily requires the sense of "snatching," certainly not that of "sniffing."

Ver. 18. **Would not suffer me to draw my breath** (comp. ch. vii. 19), **but would surfeit me with bitterness** [lit. plur. "bitternesses"]. For כִּי in the sense of "but, rather," comp. ch. v. 7; for the form. מַמְּרֹרִים, with *Dagh. dirimens* ["which gives the word a more pathetic expression," Del.], comp. Ges., § 20, 2, *b*.

Ver. 19. **If it be a question of the strength of the strong** [others (E. V. Conant, Carey, Schlott.) connect אַמִּיץ with the following הִנֵּה; but as the latter is always *followed* by the predicate, and such an exclamation in the mouth of God (see below) would be less natural than the simple interjection, the connection given in the text is to be preferred. The accents are not decisive,—E.]—**lo, here** (am I): [הִנֵּה for הִנְנִי, as אֵיהּ ch. xv. 23, is for אַיּוֹ]—*i. e.*, "would He say": He would immediately present Himself, whenever challenged to a trial of strength with His human antagonist. Similar is the sense of the second member:—**Is it a question of right who will cite me** (before the tribunal); *viz.* "would He say." [Whichever test of strength should be chosen, whether of physical strength in a trial-at-arms, or of moral strength, in a trial-at-law, what hope for weak and mortal man?—E.] The whole verse, consisting of two elliptical conditional clauses, with two still shorter concluding clauses (also hypothetical), reminds us in a measure by its structure of Rom. viii. 33-34.

Ver. 20. **Were I** (even) **right, my mouth would condemn me**: *i. e.*, from simple confusion I should not know how to make the right answer, so that my own mouth (פִּי, with logical accent on suffix, as in ch. xv. 6) would confess me guilty, though I should still be innocent—(צדק, as in ver. 15).—**Were I innocent—He would prove me perverse** [וַיַּעְקְשֵׁנִי, with Chiriq of Hiphil shortened to Sheva: comp. Ges. ℥ 53 [℥ 52] Rem. 4]. The subject is "God," not "my mouth" (Schlottmann) [Wordsworth, Davidson, Carey]; God would, even in case of my innocence, put me down as one עִקֵּשׁ, one morally corrupt, and to be rejected. "Thus brooding over the thought, true in itself, that the creature when opposed to the heavenly Ruler of the Universe must always be in the wrong, Job forgets the still higher and more important truth that God's right in opposition to the creature is always the true objective right." Delitzsch.

Third Strophe: Vers. 21-24. Open arraignment of God as an unrighteous Judge, condemning alike the innocent and the guilty.

Ver. 21. **I am innocent!** In thus repeating the expression תָּם אָנִי, Job asserts solemnly and peremptorily that which in ver. 20 *b* he had in the same words stated only conditionally.—**I value not my soul**: *i. e.*, I give myself no concern about the security of my life, I will give free utterance to that confession, cost what it may. So rightly most commentators, while Delitzsch, against the connection (see especially the 2d member) explains: "I know not myself, I am a mystery to myself, and *therefore* have no desire to live longer." [Hengstenberg: "We might explain: 'I should not know my soul,' if I were to confess to transgressions, of which I know myself to be innocent; 'I should despise my life,' seeing I have nothing with which to reproach myself. Better however: 'I know not my soul,' so low is it sunk, I am become altogether *alius a me ipso*; 'I must despise my life,' I am so unspeakably wretched, that I must wish to die"].

Ver. 22. **It is all one**: thus beyond question must the expression אַחַת־הִיא be rendered; not: "there is one measure with which God rewards the good and the wicked" (Targ., Rosenm., Hirzel); nor: "it is all the same whether man is guilty or innocent" (Delitzsch).—**Therefore I will say it out**: [Dav. "I will out with it"]. **He destroys the innocent and the wicked**: *viz.*, God, whom Job intentionally avoids naming; comp. ch. iii. 20.

Vers. 23, 24. Two illustrations confirming the terrible accusation just brought against God (ver. 22 *b*) that He destroys alike the innocent and the guilty.

Ver. 23. **If** (His) **scourge slays suddenly**, *viz.*, men. By שׁוֹט "scourge" is meant here not of course the scourge of the tongue (ch. v. 21) but a general calamity, such as pestilence, war, famine, *etc.* (Isa. xxviii. 15).—**Then He mocks at the despair of the innocent**: *i. e.*, He does not allow Himself to be disturbed in His blessed repose when those who are afflicted with those calamities faint away from despondency and despair: comp. Ps. ii. 4; lix. 9.—מַסָּה, from מסס, ch. vi. 14. [E. V., Conant, Dav., Renan, Hengst., Carey, Rod., *etc.*, give to מַסָּה here its customary sense of "trial," from נסה. Jerome remarks that in the whole book Job says nothing more bitter than this.] The interpretation of Hirzel and Delitzsch, founded on ch. xxii. 19: "His desire and delight are in the suffering of the innocent," gives a meaning altogether too strong, and not intended by the poet here.

Ver. 24. ["In this second illustration there is an advance in the thought, in so far as here a part at least of the wicked are excepted from the general ruin, nay, appear even as threatening the same to the pious." Schlott.]—**A land** [or better, because more in harmony with the sweeping and strong expressions here assigned to Job: **the earth**] **is given over to** [lit., **into the hand of**] **the wicked, and the face of its judges He veileth**: *viz.*, while that continues, while the land is delivered to the wicked, so that they are able to play their wicked game with absolute impunity.—**If** (it is) **not** (so) **now, who then does it?** אֵפוֹ (so written also ch. xvii. 15; xix. 6, 23; xxiv. 25, but outside of the book of Job generally אֵפוֹא) belongs according to the accents to the preceding conditional particles אִם־לֹא (comp. ch. xxiv. 25 and Gen. xxvii. 37); lit., therefore, "now then if not, who does it?" [Hirz., Con. and apparently Ew. connect אֵפוֹ with the interrogative following—"who then?" *quis quæso* (Heiligst.). Davidson also takes this view, although admitting that "the accentuation is decidedly the other way," אפוא being used, as he says, "in impatient questions (Ew., ℥ 105, *d*) Gen. xxvii. 33; Job xvii. 15; xix. 23"]. That the present illustration of a land ill-governed and delivered into the hands of the wicked had, as Dillmann says, "its justification in the historic background of the composition," cannot be affirmed with certainty in our ignorance of the details of this "historic background:" though indeed it is equally true that we can no more affirm the contrary.

4. *Second Division.—Second Section:* Vers. 25-35. Special application of that which is affirmed in the preceding section concerning God's arbitrary severity to his (Job's) condition.

First Strophe: Vers. 25-28. [The swift flight of his days, and the unremitting pressure of his woes, make him despair of a release].

Ver. 25. **For my days are swifter than a runner.** ["וְ introducing a particular case of the previous general: in this infinite wrong under which earth and the righteous writhe and moan, I also suffer." Dav.—"Days" here poetically personified. קַלּוּ, Perf., a deduction from past experience continuing in the present.—E.]. רָץ might, apparently, comparing this with the similar description in ch. vii. 6, denote a part of the weaver's loom, possibly the threads of the woof which are wound round the bobbin, (which the Coptic language actually calls "runners"). This signification however is by no means favored by the usage elsewhere in Hebrew of the word רָץ: this rather yields the signification

"swift runner, courier" (ἡμεροδρόμος) compare Jer. li. 31; 2 Sam. xv. 1; 2 Kings xi. 13; Esth. iii. 13, 15.—**They are fled away, without having seen good** (טוֹבָה, prosperity, happiness, as in ch. xxi. 25). Job thinks here naturally of the same "good," which he (according to ch. vii. 7) would willingly enjoy before his end, but which would not come to him before then. He has thus entirely forgotten his former prosperity in view of his present state of suffering, or rather, he does not regard it as prosperity, seeing that he had to exchange it for such severe suffering. Quite otherwise had he formerly expressed himself to his wife, ch. ii. 10.

Ver. 26. **They have swept past like skiffs of reed**; lit., "with [עִם] skiffs of reed," *i. e.*, being comparable with them (ch. xxxvii. 18; xl. 15). אֳנִיּוֹת אֵבֶה are most probably canoes of rushes or reeds, the same therefore as the כְּלֵי גֹמֶא ("vessels of bulrush") mentioned Isa. xviii. 2, whose great lightness and swiftness are in that passage also made prominent. אֵבֶה is accordingly a synonym, which does not elsewhere appear, of גמא, reed; for which definition analogy may also be produced out of the Arabic. It has however nothing to do with אֵב (so the Vulg., Targ.: naves *poma* portantes) ["fruit ships hurrying on lest the fruit should injure"]; nor with אָבָה, to desire, ["ships eagerly desiring to reach the haven"]. (Symm. νῆες σπεύδουσαι) comp. Gekatilia in Gesenius, Thes. Suppl., p. 62; nor with אֵיבָה, "enmity" (Pesh., "ships of hostility," comp. Luther: "the strong ships," by which are meant pirate ships); nor with the Abyssin. abâi, the name of the Nile; nor with a supposed Babylonian name of a river, having the same sound, and denoting perhaps the Euphrates (so Abulwalid, Rashi, *etc.*, who make the name denote a great river near the region where the scene of our book is laid). The correct signification was given by Hiller, *Hierophyt.* II., p. 302, whom most modern critics have followed.—**Like the eagle, which darts down on its prey** (comp. ch. xxxix. 29; Prov. xxx. 19; Hab. i. 8, *etc.*). This third comparison adds to that which is swiftest on the earth, and that which is swiftest in the water, that which is swiftest in the air, in order to illustrate the hasty flight of Job's days.

Vers. 27, 28. **If I think** (lit., if my saying be; comp. ch. vii. 13): **I will forget my complaint** (see on the same passage), **will leave off my countenance** (*i. e.* give up my look of pain, my morose gloomy-looking aspect, comp. 1 Sam. i. 18), **and look cheerful** (הבליג, as in ch. x. 20; Ps. xxxix. 14 (13) [the three cohortative futures here are, as Davidson says, "finely expressive—*If I say*—rousing myself from my stupor and prostration—*I will, etc.*"]; **then I shudder at all my pains, I know that Thou wilt not declare me innocent.**—These words are addressed to God, not to Bildad. Although Job felt himself to be forsaken and rejected by God, he nevertheless turns to Him; he does not speak of Him and about Him, without at the same time prayerfully looking up to Him.

Second Strophe: vers. 29-31. [He must be guilty, and all his strivings to free himself from his guilt are in vain.]

Ver. 29. **I am to be guilty**: *i. e.* according to God's arbitrary decree [אָנֹכִי, emphatic—*I*, *I* am accounted guilty, singled out for this treatment. The fut. ארשע here expressing that which must be, from which there is no escape. —E.] רָשַׁע here not "to *act* as a wicked or a guilty person" (ch. x. 15), but "to be esteemed, to appear" such, as in ch. x. 7 (comp. the Hiph. הִרְשִׁיעַ, to treat any one as guilty, to condemn. above in ver. 20).—**Wherefore then weary myself in vain**, *viz.* to appear innocent, to be acquitted by God. This wearying of himself is given as an actual fact, consisting in humbly supplicating for mercy, as he had been repeatedly exhorted to do by Eliphaz and Bildad; ch. v. 8, 17; viii. 5.—הֶבֶל, adverbially, as in ch. xxi. 34; xxxv. 16; lit. like a breath, evanescent, here—"fruitlessly, for naught, in vain." [That notwithstanding his present mood, he does subsequently renew his exertions, "impelled by an irresistible inward necessity, is psychologically perfectly natural."—Schlottman.]

Vers. 30, 31. **If I should wash myself in snow-water** (read with the K'ri בְמֵי־ instead of with the K'thibh בְמוֹ־שֶׁלֶג; bathing immediately in undissolved snow is scarcely to be thought of here) [an unnecessary refinement: for washing the *hands*, which is what the verse speaks of, snow can be used, and is scarcely less efficacious for cleansing than lye. The K'thibh is to be preferred.—E.], **and cleanse my hands with lye** (בּוֹר fully written for בֹּר, Is. i. 25, signifies precisely as in this parallel passage lye, a vegetable alkali, not: purity [as E. V.: "make my hands never so clean,' for "make clean in purity"], which rendering would give a much tamer signification [besides "destroying the literality of the parallelism"]), **then Thou wouldest plunge me into the ditch** (שַׁחַת, here a sink, sewer), **so that my clothes would abhor me.**—In these latter words, it is naturally presupposed that the one who has been bathed and thoroughly cleansed as to the entire body while *still naked* is again plunged into a filthy ditch, and that in consequence of this, he becomes a terror to his own clothes, which are personified, so that they as it were start back and resist, when it is sought to put them on him. So correctly most modern expositors. On the contrary, Ewald and Gesenius—Rödiger take the Piel תִּעֵב in a causative sense: "so that my clothes would cause me to be abhorred,"—a rendering in favor of which, indeed, Ezek. xvi. 25 can be brought forward, but not the *usus loquendi* of our book (comp. ch. xix. 19; xxx. 10) which knows no causative sense for תִּעֵב. [The thought expressed by the two verses is that "not even the best-grounded self-justification can avail him, for God would still bring it to pass that his clearly proved innocence should change to the most horrible impurity." Delitzsch.]

Third Strophe: vers. 32-35. ["The cause of Job's inability to make out his innocence—not his guilt, but the character and conditions of his accuser," who has no superior to overrule Him, to mediate between Him and Job. Let Him lay aside His terrors, and Job would plead his cause without fear.]

Ver. 32. **For** [He is] **not a man like me, that I should answer Him:** *viz*,. before a tribunal, with a view to the settlement of the controversy. Hirzel translates אִישׁ כָּמֹנִי as though it were accusative to אֶעֱנֶנּוּ: "for I cannot answer Him as a man who is my equal;" but this is altogether too artificial. ["God is not his equal standing on the same level with him. He, the Absolute Being, is accuser and judge in one person; there is between them no arbitrator, *etc.*" DELITZSCH.]

Ver. 33. **There is no arbiter between us who might lay his hand on us both:** so that accordingly we should both have to betake ourselves to him, and accept his decision. מוֹכִיחַ is one who gives a decision, an arbitrator who weighs the pleas put in by both the contending parties, and pronounces the award. Not inaptly JOHN PYE SMITH, *Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and priesthood of Jesus Christ*, 5th Ed. p. 98: "There is between us no arguer, who might fully represent the cause, and state, judge and arbitrate fairly for each party." Observe how emphatically is expressed here, although indeed only indirectly and negatively, the postulate of a true mediator and priestly proprietor between God and sinful humanity! ["It is singular how often Job gives utterance to wants and aspirations which under the Christian economy are supplied and gratified. It was the purpose of the writer to let us hear these voices crying in the wilderness, forerunning the complete manifestation of the Messiah, and therefore the Church is well authorized in using this language of Christ. Job out of his religious entanglement proclaimed the necessity of a mediator to humanize God two thousand years before he came." DAV.] The *optative* form ["Would that there might be"] which the LXX. and the Pesh. give to the verse by changing לֹא to לוּ (לֻא), is unnecessary and disturbs the connection with the preceding verse [the thought of which is completed only in this verse. This rendering is, moreover, not suited to the יֵשׁ following. The jussive form יָשֵׁת *does* however reflect the *yearning* which breathes through his pathetic declaration of the fact that there is no arbiter.—E.].

Vers. 34, 35 are related to each other as antecedent and consequent. The two optatives in ver. 34 are followed by the cohortative אֲדַבְּרָה without וְ as the apodosis (comp. Ewald, § 347, *b*, 357, *b*).—**Let Him take away from me His rod** (with which He smites me, comp. ch. xiii. 21, equivalent therefore to שׁוֹט, scourge, calamity, comp. ver. 23), **and let not His terror overawe** [or stupefy] **me** (אֵמָתוֹ in the objective sense, that which is awful in His appearance, the terror which proceeds from His majestic presence): **then will I speak without fear before Him; for not thus am I with myself:** *i. e.* for not thus does it stand with me in my inward man, I am not conscious of anything within me of such a character that I must be afraid before Him. עִם therefore points to that which is within, the consciousness or conscience, as in ch. x. 13; xv. 9; xxiii. 14, *etc.* That לֹא כֵן here expresses so much as: "not so small, not so contemptible," is a conjecture of Delitzsch's, which is supported neither by the connection, nor by Hebrew usage elsewhere. [Delitzsch imagines the expression to be "accompanied by a gesture expressive of the denial of such contempt." Not dissimilar in this respect is Renan's explanation: "'For in the depths of my heart I am not such as I seem.' The conscience of Job is tranquil: the cause of his trouble is without himself. It is God, who by a treacherous maneuvre has arrayed against him His terrors, in order to take away from him the freedom of spirit necessary for his defense."]

5. *Third Division:* ch. x.—A plaintive description of the pitiless severity with which God rages against him, although by virtue of His omniscience He knows his innocence.

Vers. 1-12: *Exordium* (ver. 1) and *First Double Strophe* (Vers. 2-12): developing the motive to this new complaint.

Ver. 1. ["With brief preface of words which force themselves from the heart in *three* convulsive sobs (1 *a b c*), like the sparse large drops before the storm . . . the patriarch opens his cause in the ear of heaven." DAV.]—**My soul is weary of my life.**—נָקְטָה, equivalent to נָקֹטָה, Ezek. vi. 9, Perf. Niph. of קוּט, which is synonymous with קוּט or קוּץ, to feel disgust. [Ges. and Fürst give a root נקט, from which Delitzsch also says it may be derived as a secondary verb formed from the Niph. נָקֹט—a form which is also supported by the Aramaic.] For the thought comp. ch. vii. 15, 16; ix. 21.—**Therefore will I give free course to my complaint:** עָלַי, lit. "with me, in me" (comp. ch. xxx. 16; Ps. xlii. 6 [5], 12 [11]; Jer. viii. 18), not "over me." [The cohortative futures are to be noted as expressive of the strength of Job's feeling and purpose.] In regard to the rest of the verse [**I will speak in the bitterness of my soul**], comp. ch. vii. 11; Ps. lv. 18 [17]. ["Job continues to believe that the boldness of his speech will be punished with death." RENAN.]

First Strophe: vers. 2-11. An appeal to God not to deal so severely with him, seeing that his innocence is already well known to Him.

Vers. 2, 3. ["God's dealing with Job was derogatory to the divine character, and dangerous and confounding to the interests of religion, and the first principles of religious men."—DAV.]

Ver. 2. **I will say to Eloah: condemn** (comp. ch. ix. 20) **me not.** Observe that Job addresses this complaint also to God, like that in ch. ix. 28. **Let me know wherefore Thou contendest with me** (as adversary

and judge (רִיב with Accus. as in Is. xxvii. 8; xlix. 25.

Ver. 3. **Doth it please Thee that Thou oppressest, that Thou rejectest the work of Thy hands?**—In this question Job touches on a first possibility which might be supposed to determine God to treat him as guilty. He inquires whether it may perchance "please" God, be agreeable to Him, give Him joy, thus to deal with himself. For הֲטוֹב לְךָ in this sense, comp. ch. xiii. 9; Deut. xxiii. 17 [16]. The interpretation adopted by Dillmann and others is also possible: "is it becoming for Thee," *etc.*, for which comp. Ex. xiv. 12; Judg. ix. 2.—[So besides Dillmann (who argues that this sense is better suited to the remonstrance with God), Ewald, Schlottmann, and Davidson, who says: "טוֹב *decet*, not as others *juvat*. The argument is that God's treatment of Job, a righteous man, with such severity, was unbecoming a righteous God, and that the world expected other things, and that such things tended to the consternation of religious men, and the confusion of all fixed religious principles"]. Job here calls himself "the work of God's hands," not in order to excite sympathy in God, nor in order to touch, as it were, the honor of Him who had so elaborately and carefully formed him in his mother's womb (Ps. cxxxix. 15), but principally in order to call attention to *his innocence*, in order to indicate that he had essentially persevered in that *status integritatis* in which God had created him. [Job seems in this designation of himself to have had two things in view, closely associated in his mind, as the connection shows: first, the elaborate workmanship of his body (conveyed by the term יְגִיעַ, lit. the product of toilsome labor), which God had dishonored by the loathsome disease which He had sent upon him; and next the moral perfection, which he claimed still to possess, but which God had likewise dishonored by treating him as a sinner.—E.] This view is favored, not only by vers. 7, 8, but also by the circumstantial clause which immediately follows [shown to be a circumstantial clause by the fact that the verses following are the expansion of the preceding part of the verse]: **While Thou shinest on the counsel of the wicked;** *i. e.* favorest it, and causest it to succeed, comp. Ps. xxxi. 17 [16]; lxvii. 2 [1]; Num. vi. 25.

Ver. 4. **Hast Thou eyes of flesh** (*i. e.*, eyes limited to objects of sense, perceiving only the surface of things; comp. Isa. xxxi. 3), **or seest Thou as man seeth?** *i. e.*, with a vision short-sighted and superficial as man's (comp. 1 Sam. xvi. 7). By this question a second possible reason why God might be supposed to treat Job as guilty is indicated as being in reality out of the question; or, in other words: an appeal is taken to His omniscience, to His infallible knowledge of that which lies before Him in men's hearts.

Ver. 5. **Are Thy days as the days of a mortal, or Thy years as the days of a man?** —A *third* possibility is here indicated: that God might be, like men, short-lived; that in general He might be, like them, a mortal, a limited, changeable creature. This third and last possible reason is obviously related to both the preceding (not simply to that which immediately precedes, as Welte and Hahn think) as cause to effect, or as that which is deepest and most fundamental to that which belongs rather to the outward appearance.

Ver. 6. **That Thou** (so zealously) **seekest after my guilt, and searchest after my sins?** *i. e.*, that Thou doest what short-sighted men would do, seekest to extort from me the confession of a guilt which has escaped Thy vision, by the application of inquisitorial tortures, *viz.*, by decreeing that I should suffer. ["Such a mode of proceeding may be conceived of in a mortal ruler, who, on account of his short-sightedness, seeks to bring about by severe measures that which was at first only conjecture, and who, from the apprehension that he may not witness that vengeance in which he delights, hastens forward the criminal process as much as possible, in order that his victim may not escape him. God, however, to whom belongs absolute knowledge and absolute power, would act thus, although," *etc.* (see next verse). DELITZSCH. And Schlottmann (after Wolfssohn) quotes the following from the Sifri on Deut. xxxii. 40: "And I say, I live for ever. It is in my power at once to recompense the wicked, but I live for ever, and hasten not the retribution. A king of flesh and blood hastens the retribution, for he fears that he or his enemy may die, but I live for ever."]

Ver. 7. **Although Thou knowest** (עַל here equivalent to "notwithstanding, although" ["lit. *upon*, or *over and above*, *in addition to*, *in spite of*"], as in chap. xvi. 17; xxxiv. 6; Isa. liii. 9) **that I am not guilty** (comp. chap. ix. 29) **and there is no one who delivers out of Thy hand**—*i. e.*, that Thou, in any case, whether we men are guilty or not, hast us completely in Thy power, and canst do with us what Thou wilt: hence Thou actest strangely in seeking so zealously for reasons why Thou shouldst condemn us.

Second Strophe. Vers. 8–12. The severe treatment which God inflicts on Job stands in cruel contradiction not only to His omniscience, but also to His paternal goodness and love. ["The feeling of contradiction between the Deity's past and present rises ever in intensity in Job's breast, and in amazement he sets the two in blank opposition to each other before God Himself—let *Him* reconcile Himself with Himself if He may. While there is fearful keenness of dialectic here, there is also irresistible tenderness of expostulation. The appeal is from God to God: Thy hands have made me, and Thou destroyest me." DAV.]

Ver. 8. **Thy hands have carefully formed and perfected me.**—["The hinge of connection with the last strophe is מִיָּדְךָ, nor can deliver from Thy *hand*—Thy *hands* have made me." DAV.]. The thought conveyed by the phrase יְגִיעַ כַּפֶּיךָ is here again resumed from ver. 3 and expanded in a description in which there are several points of agreement with Ps. cxxxix. 13–16.—עִצְּבוּנִי, lit. "have carved me" (עִצֵּב, a Piel intensive, cognate with קצב, חצב), *i. e.*, elaborately formed ["especially appropriate as de-

scribing the fashioning of the complicated nature of man." DEL.]. The following עָשָׂה bears the same relation to this עִצֵּב as *perficere, consummare* bears to the simple *fingere*. The clause added in *b*, יַחַד סָבִיב, "altogether round about" (Vulg.: *me totum in circuitu*) represents the fashioning and perfecting activity of God as concerned with man's entire organism, including all his limbs and parts. [**And yet** (ו consec. with strong adversative sense) **Thou destroyest me!**—An exclamation of amazement and reproach.]

Ver. 9. **Remember now** [the particle נָא is expressive of a yearning plaintiveness here—*Oh, remember!*] **that as clay Thou hast perfected me**: to wit, formed me out of the crude earth-material with the same skill and care as the potter a vessel of clay. For the use of this favorite figure of the Holy Scriptures, especially of the Old Testament, comp. ch. xxxiii. 6; Isa. xxix. 16; xlv. 9; Jer. xviii. 6; Rom. ix. 20, 21. That the same figure serves to illustrate not merely the wise skill and the loving care of the Creator, but also and above all His arbitrary fullness of power, and His unconditional right in His creatures (the *jus absolutum Creatoris in creaturas*), is evident from the second member: "and wilt Thou turn me again into dust?" which at the same time reminds us of Gen. ii. 7; iii. 19 and of Jer. xviii. [That the Divine Arbitrariness, which is the conception held by a perverted mind of the Divine Sovereignty, enters into Job's train of thought here is plain enough. But that it is the *prominent* notion may certainly be doubted. This is scarcely consistent with the urgent pathos of the plea: "Oh! remember that thou hast formed me as the clay!" The central thought as expressed by the verbs in ver. 8, especially עִצֵּב, by the adverbial clause יַחַד סָבִיב, and by the detailed description of vers. 10–11, is that of the exquisite elaborate workmanship involved in his creation, and the wonder that the Divine Artist should be so regardless of His work as wantonly to ruin it.—E.]

Ver. 10. **Didst Thou not pour me out as milk**—*viz.:* in the act of conception, when my body received its development out of a purely liquid material.—[The Imperfects in this verse and the following have their time determined by the Perfects of vers. 8, 9. The use of the Imperf. may be explained with Ewald: "because the wonder is so vividly present to Job's mind;" or, as Davidson expresses it: "Job again feels the Divine hand upon him."—E.] **And curdled me like cheese?**—to wit, into the formless mass of the embryo, which in Ps. cxxxix. 16 is called גֹּלֶם, but here is compared with גְּבִינָה, *i. e.*, cheese (lit. curd, the pap-like material of cheese not yet hardened, not "cream" (Schlott.) nor "whey" (Hahn and Ewald) [neither of these definitions being suitable for the reason that the material is not coagulated]). For הִתִּיךְ, to pour out, comp. 2 Kings xxii. 9 (likewise the Kal above in chap. iii. 24). "To pour into a mould" is a signification which belongs to the word neither here nor in the parallel passage just given (against Seb. Schmidt and Delitzsch): this would be rather נִסֵּךְ or יָצַק. ["The development of the embryo was regarded by the Israelitish Chokma as one of the greatest mysteries." Eccles. xi. 5; 2 Macc. vii. 22 sq. Del.]

Ver. 11. **With skin and flesh Thou didst clothe me, and with bones and sinews Thou didst interweave me.**—(שׂוֹכֵךְ from שׂוּךְ, chap. i. 10, synonymous with סכך in the parallel passage, Ps. cxxxix. 13.) [The verse may be regarded as a continuation of the question in ver. 10. So Con., Dav., *etc.*] Grotius rightly observes that the description here given of the development of the fœtus is in general true to nature, and corresponds to the actual process (*hic ordo in genitura est: primum pellicula fit, deinde in ea caro, duriora paulatim accedunt*). With equal correctness most modern expositors remark that this agreement of the description with the natural processes of conception and development is only of a general sort, and that the passage must not be pressed, as is done by Scheuchzer, Oetinger, *etc.* [as "including and going beyond all *systemata generationis*"], seeing that this is to attribute to the Holy Scriptures a purpose which is foreign to it.

Ver. 12. **Life and favor** ["this combination does not occur elsewhere." DEL.] **hast Thou shown me** (lit. "done to me"—עָשָׂה, referring at the same time by zeugma to the first object, "life"), **and Thy oversight** (Thy providence, πρόνοια) **has preserved my breath:** has done this, to wit, not only during the embryonic state, but through the whole time from my birth to the present. By רוּחַ are designated at the same time both the *breath* as the outward sign of life, and the *spirit* as its inward principle; comp. chap. xvii. 1; Eccles. iii. 19.

Third Division. Second Half (Double Strophe). Vers. 13–22. Continuation of the complaint, and a further advance in the same to the point of wishing that he had never been born.

First Strophe. Vers. 13–17. [God's goodness in the past simulated, his secret purpose having from the first contemplated the infliction of suffering on Job, whether guilty or innocent.—E.]

Ver. 13. **And** (nevertheless) **Thou didst hide these things in Thy heart.**—[וְ strongly adversative: *yet*, notwithstanding all Thy care in my creation, and all Thy apparent kindness in the past, Thy hidden purpose all the time contemplated my destruction. The connection of this verse is evidently with what follows, and its place is at the beginning of the present strophe. אֵלֶּה and זֹאת cannot refer to the care and favor bestowed on him in his creation and preservation, for it could not be said of these that God had "hidden them in His heart;" they must refer to the present and coming manifestations of the Divine displeasure, which are about to be detailed, and which Job here charges as the consummation of God's secret eternal plan.—E.] Since the discourse, after the mild conciliatory turn which it had taken in the last division, especially in ver. 12, here evidently falls back into the bitter tone of complaint, it follows that the וְ at the beginning of this verse is to be taken adversatively. **I know that this was in Thy**

mind—*i. e.*, that this determination had long been formed by Thee (זאת עִמָּךְ as in chap. xxiii. 14; xxvii. 11), *viz.*, to assail me, and visit me with the direst calamities, in the manner described in the following verses, 14-17.

Ver. 14. **If I should sin, Thou wouldest watch me.**—וּשְׁמַרְתַּנִי, lit., *custodies me*, here *custoditurus eras me*, as these verses in general exhibit that which, in Job's opinion, God had long since determined, and had the disposition to do. שמר here moreover is not "to keep in remembrance, to bear anything in mind" (Stickel, Hirzel, Delitzsch, for then the accus. of the thing kept ought to have been expressed (comp. Prov. iv. 21; vii. 1).—The meaning is rather to watch one carefully, to hold under observation, *rigide observare s. custodire aliquem;* comp. ch. vii. 12; xiii. 27.

Ver. 15. **If I should be wicked—woe unto me!**—As is evident from this exclamation אַלְלַי לִי, "woe unto me!" which takes the place of a clause expressing the consequence in the future, רשעתי is a *stronger* expression than חטאתי in the verse preceding. ["אללי very strongly expressive of terror or pain, Mic. vii. 1; words would fail to describe the violence of the punishment." Dav. As much stronger therefore as אללי is than שמר, so much stronger, it may be inferred, is רשע here than חטא.—E.]. It must not therefore be weakened by rendering it (with Schlottmann and Olshausen) "being found guilty;" it expresses the idea of gross, presumptuous sinning, deserving of a punishment indescribably severe (here indicated only by an exclamation of woe).—**And were I righteous** (the opposite case of the two hitherto mentioned) **I should not then** (according to God's plan and purpose) **lift up my head**: *i. e.*, I should not dare to enjoy my righteousness, nor to profit by my good conscience so as to look up with freedom and confidence: comp. ch. xi. 15; xxii. 26; Luke xxi. 28. Rather would he even then go his way like one who had an evil conscience: **filled with shame, and in sight of my misery.**—רְאֵה is either to be taken as constr. state of an adj. רָאֶה, not elsewhere occurring (of a like structure with יָפֶה, קָשֶׁה, *etc.*, so Gesenius, Fürst, Welte, Hahn, Del. [Schult., Schlot., Dav.] *etc.*), or we are to read רֹאֵה (Piscator, Ewald, Hirz., Böttch., Dillm. [Ren., Hengst.] *etc.*): for to take it as Imper. [E. V., "therefore see thou mine affliction"] (De Wette), or as Infin. (Umbreit, Rosenm.) [Carey] makes the construction altogether too hard.

Ver. 16. **And should it** (my head) **lift itself up**: *i. e.*, should I, although condemned by Thee, still exhibit a cheerful courage and a proud self-consciousness. This accordingly is not a new case, but an expansion of that just supposed in ver. 15 *b*. On יִגְאֶה comp. ch. viii. 11; on the omission of אם see Ewald, § 357, *b*. **As a lion Thou wouldest** (then) **hunt me and again show Thy wondrous power in me**: to wit, by means of the most exquisite tortures, and the most violent persecutions, with which Thou wouldest then visit me. ["Thou wast wonderful in my creation (vers. 8-12); and now Thou art wonderful in inventing new means of destroying me." Words.]. כַּשַּׁחַל certainly belongs to God as the subj. addressed, not to Job as obj. (as Schlottmann [and Davidson] think). We find God in His anger compared to a beast of prey also in ch. xvi. 9; He is in particular described as a lion tearing His prey in Hos. v. 14; xiii. 7; comp. Isa. xxxi. 4; xxxviii. 13; Jer. xxv. 38; Lam. iii. 10; Am. iii. 12. On the use of שוב with a finite verb following to express the adverbial notion "again, repeatedly"—a construction similar to that above in ch. vi. 28—comp. Ewald, § 285, *b*. On תִּתְפַּלָּא, with final vowel *â*, although not in pause (as also in Num. xix. 12), see Ewald, § 141, *c*. [Ewald, who is followed by Davidson, finds in the details of the Divine Plan against Job as here unfolded "a cruel tetralemma, a fearful fourfold net," to compass the ruin of Job whichever way he should turn. (1) Were he to err—and to err is human—God would watch him with the keenest eye, and punish him without pity. (2). Should he sin heinously, his punishment would be commensurate with his guilt, transcending all description. (3). Should he however be innocent he must still be doomed to bear about with him a guilty look, and seem and feel like a criminal. (4). Should he be unable from pride, or conscious innocence thus to belie his integrity, and dare to hold up his head, God would in His wrath hunt him like a lion.—The scheme is ingenious and plausible, and has not yet been successfully disproved. Schlottmaun argues against it: (1). That the distinction it makes between רשע and חטא is forced, to which what has been said above is a sufficient answer. (2). That the mention in ver. 15 of the possibility of being righteous along with that of being wicked is wholly superfluous! a remark which it is difficult to understand. Job is enumerating all the moral possibilities of his condition, and showing that whichever course he takes his Omnipotent Adversary is there to meet him with a flaming sword of vengeance. Assuming therefore Ewald's view to be not unfounded, the following additional remarks suggest themselves concerning it. 1. In the first two hypotheses, in which the guilt of Job is assumed, the hypothetical element is made distinct and strong by the use of אִם; in the last two, which assume his innocence the אִם is omitted. 2. Each pair of hypotheses presents a climax, the second hypothesis being an advance upon the first, both in the protasis and apodosis; the fourth upon the third, especially in the apodosis.—E.].

Ver. 17. **Thou wouldest renew Thy witnesses against me**: *i. e.*, ever cause new witnesses to appear against me, *viz.*, ever new *sufferings* and calamities: comp. ch. xvi. 8, where may be found the same personification of sufferings as witnesses which, in the eyes of men, ever rise up to testify against him and his innocence. —**And increase Thy displeasure against me** (עִם here the same as *contra;* comp. ch. xiii. 19; xxiii. 6; xxxi. 13); **ever new troops**

and an army against me. The phrase חֲלִיפוֹת וְצָבָא is not to be understood as a hendiadys, as if it denoted "ever new hosts, alternating hosts" ["with host succeeding host against me": Con., Dav., Ren., Words., Schlott., Ges., Noy., *etc.*], for this idea would be more simply expressed by חֲלִיפוֹת צָבָא (against Hirzel and most moderns). Rather does צבא denote the main body of the army, while חֲלִיפוֹת, lit., "exchanges" are fresh advancing reserves, or reinforcements. With the former, the original main army, are compared Job's principal sufferings, while the latter the reserve troops, denote the new species of pains and tortures with which God continually afflicts and vexes him (Job being represented as a fortress, the object of God's hostile attack; comp. ch. xix. 12; xxx. 12). [חליפות stands first as being the prominent element, Job's mind dwelling principally, though not altogether, on the *new* tortures with which God assailed him, as is evident also from תחדש and תרב just before.—E.]. Moreover it will be seen that every verse—member from ver. 14 to ver. 18 inclusive ends in the vowel *î*, a fact already noted by Böttcher, which can scarcely be accidental. The impression that the Divine wrath has especial reference to the single individuality (the one *I*) of the lamenting Job is strongly intensified by this continuous repetition of the rhyme from the pronominal inflection (Delitzsch).

Second Strophe: Vers. 18–22, consisting of two thoughts: *a.* Curse of his own existence—vers. 18, 19 (a condensed repetition of ch. iii. 11-16); *b.* Prayer for a short respite before going down into the dark realm of the dead (repeated out of ch. vii. 16-19).

Ver. 18. **Why then didst Thou bring me forth out of the womb? I should have died,** *etc.* "The Imperfects אֶגְוַע, אֶהְיֶה, אוּבָל have a hypothetic coloring, being strictly the conclusion of a pre-supposition indicated by the preceding question. They indicate *what would have happened,* if God had not called him into being out of his mother's womb, in his opinion, which he, as a wise man, here puts in opposition to the Divine treatment" (Dillmann). [The Eng. Ver. "Oh that I had given up the ghost, and no eye had seen me!" is feeble, and destroys the unity of the passage formed by this member, and the verse following, represented as above indicated by the three conditional Imperfects.—E.].

Ver. 19. הוּבָל expresses the idea of being borne in slow solemn procession, as is customary in burial; so also in ch. xxi. 32.

Ver. 20. **Are not my days few? Let Him cease then,—let Him let me alone.**—Thus are the words to be rendered according to the K'thibh יֶחְדַּל and יָשִׁית, not as a petition addressed to God, but as a request expressed concerning Him in the third person, as one who had withdrawn. The K'ri, in giving instead the Imperf. וַחֲדַל and וְשִׁית: "cease," and "let me alone" (so also most of the Ancient Versions), [E. V.], is a change of the original text, suggested by ch. vii. 16, which passage is here imitated, although indeed only freely. [This use of the 3d person here, following the K'thibh which undoubtedly is the correct reading, is a noticeable and masterly stroke, expressing the helpless, exhausted prostration of Job's spirit at the close of his discourse.—The vehement Titanic energy of his previous defiance has expended itself: he no more ventures to stand up face to face with God, and with head uplifted pour forth his bitter remonstrances: he now lies low in the dust, panting with the weary strife, with no hope but in death, and with averted, down-cast eye, exclaims *of* God—"Let *Him* cease for a little while!" Another indication of his mental exhaustion is found in the fact that the remainder of his discourse is made to consist of a repetition of phrases from ch. vii.—He can only repeat, mechanically almost, what he has said, although even in this there is inimitable pathos.—E.]. שִׁית מִן, to turn away the attention from any one, like שָׁעָה with מִן, ch. vii. 19; Ps. xxxix. 14 [13]; to supply לֵב, or עֵינַיִם, or יָד (after ch. xiii. 21) is not really necessary.—**That I may be cheerful a little while,** lit., look up brightly, as in ch. ix. 27; Ps. xxxix. 14 [13].

Ver. 21. **Before I go hence and return not:** [second clause וְלֹא אָשׁוּב adverbial, = not to return]. Comp. ch. vii. 7-10. An צלמות, comp. on ch. iii. 5.

Ver. 22. **Into the land of darkness, like to midnight.**—So Ewald, Dillmann, *etc.*, in order to express the idea of an *intensified* degree of darkness, indicated by אֹפֶל (lit., "covering": see ch. iii. 6; xxiii. 17; xxviii. 3; Ps. xci. 6). **—Of the shadow of death, and of confusion.**—לֹא סְדָרִים [סדרים ἅπ. λεγ. in the Old Testament, but a common word in the later Hebrew, Del.], lit., "no ranks," *i. e.*, disorder, chaotic confusion (Tohuvabohu, Gen. i. 2). For this use of לֹא, as a terse negation of the conception of a noun, like our prefix un-, or dis-, comp. ch. viii. 11; xxvi. 2, 3.—**Where it is bright like midnight.** וַתֹּפַע, lit., "so that it shines forth, is bright (comp. ch. iii. 4; x. 3). The subj. of this verb is certainly אֶרֶץ (Hirzel, Delitzsch, *etc.*); the neuter use of the fem. תפע is less probable. אֹפֶל here again signifying the most intense darkness, the most sunless gloom, (*ipsum medullitium umbræ mortis, ejusque intensissimum,* Oetinger). "To be bright like midnight" (the direct opposite of Ps. cxxxix. 12) is a strong terribly vivid description of superlative darkness, as it rules in the under-world. Compare Milton's: "not light, but darkness visible," in his description of hell.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The fundamental thought, around which all the discussions of this new discourse of Job resolve, is that of absolute power in God, and of

that power acting in a merciless arbitrary manner, entirely regardless of all human right and innocence. "*He destroys the innocent as well as the guilty*;"—such is the harsh utterance against God as a tyrant, raging in anger, trampling down all right under His feet (ch. ix. 22), to which Job advances from the concession which he has previously made to both his opponents, that God's action is always and uniformly just (comp. Exeget. and Crit. Rem's., No. 1). He concedes to them, especially to Bildad, without further question: "what God does must be right, just because God, the Righteous One, does it." But with bitter sarcasm he resolves this into the proposition: "God does just what He pleases, whether it is really righteous or not!" Thus, instead of the God of absolute justice, whom the friends had held up before him and defended (in a way that was one-sided and narrow enough, to be sure), he forms for himself a gloomy, horrible representation of a *God of absolute power*, who rules and directs not according to objective standards of right, but according to the promptings of an arbitrary will, subject to no restraint. It is the *θεὸς δίκαιος* of Marcion, who is absolutely and in essence disjoined from all kindness and love; nay, more, it is the God of the predestinatianists and extreme (supra-lapsarian) Calvinists, disposing of the destinies of men in accordance with an unconditional, arbitrary decree (*decretum absolutum*), irrespective of all moral worthiness or unworthiness—such is the Being whom Job here delineates, and before whose hostile assaults on his person, guiltless as he knows himself to be, he recoils in shuddering anguish. Instead of dwelling as he had formerly done (ch. ii. 10) on the remembrance of the manifold goodness which he had experienced from God, and bowing in patience beneath His hand, and confidently awaiting the explanation in the near or remote future of the dark destiny which according to an inscrutable decree overshadowed him, he here thrusts away from himself all such comfort, writhes like a worm under the crushing pressure of that horrible spectre into which his perverted imagination had transformed the only just and holy God, imputes to Him the severe treatment which although innocent he had endured as a long-cherished and well-contrived plan (ch. x. 13-17), and finally relapses into that tone of deepest despair and most disconsolate woe which he had heretofore struck upon, by cursing his existence (ch. x. 18 seq.) and beseeching God for just one thing—that before he should depart hence into the eternally dark and joyless Hereafter, He would once again let him alone, that he might have one short last respite in this life. In short it is the sorely tried sufferer, who is not indeed really forsaken by God, but who has nevertheless given himself up, who here pours out his grief without restraint in a lamentation which is at the same time throughout an arraignment of God. Comp. Luther in his Preface to our book: "For before that Job cometh into the pangs of death, he praiseth God concerning the spoiling of his goods, and the death of his children. But when death is before his eyes, and God withdraweth Himself, then do his words show what manner of thoughts a man, however holy he be, may have against God; how it seemeth to him that God is not God, but a mere judge and an angry tyrant, who exerciseth His power, and careth for no man's well-being. This is the most extreme part of this book. Only those can understand it, who also feel and know what it is to endure God's wrath and judgment, and to have His mercy hid from them."

2. Under the rough shell of this abstract predestinatianist way of thinking, the discourse conceals a rich store of glorious religious truths, and powerful testimonies in behalf of a living saving faith, which show to us that Job has been sorely afflicted indeed, but not rejected; nay, more, that bright beams of Divine light pierce the thick darkness, and line with glory the edges of the black clouds of doubt which have come between him and the gracious face of his Heavenly Father. As Brentius beautifully says: "Here you have the blasphemies of hell, into which those are tempted who are for any time judicially forsaken by the Lord; . . . but Job argues his cause according to his feelings: for in such dread of the judgment as possesses him he feels God to be not a Father, but an executioner. . . . But mark, at this point the faith of Job lifts up its head even in the midst of judgment! For as Christ, our Lord, when cast into the midst of hell, cries out that He is forsaken, yet at the same time acknowledges God to be His God—for He says: *My God*, why hast Thou forsaken me? so Job, overwhelmed with all evils, wondering how God, who was before so generous, can now be so cruel a Judge, recounts in the spirit of faith the mercies of the past from the time before his birth until his growth to manhood; for unless a spark of faith had been left in him, he would not have been able to recognize the mercies which he enumerates (ch. x. 8-12)." Among these testimonies to the fact that in the midst of all the darkness and judicial terrors which assailed him he still maintained his faith, may be mentioned:

a. The glorious *description which he gives in* ch. ix. 5-12 *of the Omnipotence and greatness of God*, as the same is manifested in the works of His creation, both on earth and in heaven—one of the most elevated descriptions which the poetic literature of the Old Testament has anywhere produced on this topic.

b. The strikingly beautiful description which he gives of *the special care and the infinite skill and wisdom* exercised by the providence of God in its influence on man's generation, on the earliest development of the individual human life in the womb, and on every subsequent stage of that development up to mature manhood: ch. x. 8-12.—This, too, like the former, is one of the noblest contributions of this book to physico-theology, and to the Bible doctrine of the creation of the individual human life, and of the origin of the soul. Like the parallel passage in Ps. cxxxix. 13-16, this description seems decidedly to favor the theory of *creationism*, according to which the generation of each individual man presupposes a concurrent act of immediate creation on the part of the Divine omnipotence (comp. Lactantius, *De opif Dei, c.* 19). At the same time it is evident, especially from ver. 10, with the strong emphasis which it lays on the participation of

the parents in the origination of the human organism, that the fundamental idea of traducianism, or generationism, is not foreign to the writer's thought, but is to be included in it as a presupposition which is not to be ignored. So then these two methods of representation, that of creationism and that of generationism, must always and everywhere go hand in hand, mutually supplementing and rectifying one another, (comp. Nitzsch, *Syst. of Christ. Doct.* § 107, Rem. 2; Rothe, *Eth.* § 124, Rem. 1; Frohschammer, *Ueber Ursprung der menschlichen Seele*, 1854).

c. Again, *the absolute superiority of the Divine intelligence to the human*, and hence the infinite knowledge and unapproachable wisdom of God, are described in ch. ix. 3, 4 (comp. ver. 14 seq.; ch. x. 4) with an impressive power and beauty, rivalling the most important of those Old Testament passages (*e. g.* Ps. cxxxix.) where this theme is unfolded.

d. When in contrast with all this Job comes to speak of *the weakness, vanity, and transitoriness of human existence*, his words are not less impressive and eloquent. They resemble (especially ch. ix. 25 seq. "For my days are swifter than a runner, *etc.*", comp. ch. x. 20. "Are not my days few," *etc.*) those passages in Job's earlier lament, at the beginning of ch. vii., where he describes the transiency and vanity of man's life on earth; but they also resemble similar passages in the preceding discourses of Eliphaz and Bildad. Thus it is that this complaint over the hasty flight and the misery of human life, presents itself as a constant theme with all the speakers of this book, and is indeed a characteristic property of all the Chokmah poets and teachers of the Old Testament generally.

e. With this repeated emphasizing of human weakness is closely connected the prominence given to the consciousness, characteristic of the Old Testament stand-point of faith and life, of such superiority in God over man as makes it absolutely impossible for the latter to contend, or to come into comparison with Him, there being no *arbiter* or judicial *mediator* between both (ch. ix. 32 seq.). The recognition of this both indirectly postulates such a mediator and prompts to an expression of the yearning felt for him; comp. above on ch. ix. 33.

f. Finally, it is a noticeable trait of Job's profound piety that repeatedly, in the midst of his sorrowful complaint, *he addresses himself directly to God.* Indeed, from ch. ix. 28 on, he no longer speaks in the third person *of* God, but in the second person *to* Him. This *tone of entreaty*, which the sorely afflicted sufferer maintains, even where he utters the bitterest complaints and accusations against God, is instructive in regard to that which should be regarded as in general the fundamental frame of his soul (comp. on ch. ix. 28, and on ch. x. 2). According to this, he appears as one whom God had in truth *not* forsaken, but only afflicted for the sake of proving him. Indeed, far from being objectively forsaken of God, he is not once guilty of forsaking God in the subjective sense (*i. e.* in a spirit of self-will, through doubt, disobedience or open apostasy). In the inmost depths of his praying heart, he does not once *believe* that he is forsaken or rejected by God; he only *fears* such a doom in passing, but every time springs shuddering back with hope, or at least with longing to God, and (like a child, severely chastised, which nevertheless knows no other refuge and no other comfort than may be found with its father) does not stop clinging to the Heavenly Author of his being, ever renewing his complaints and petitions to Him for help. "It is true that Job, so long as he regards his sufferings as a dispensation of divine judgment, is as unjust towards God as he believes God to be unjust towards him; but if we bear in mind that this state of conflict and temptation does not preclude the idea of a temporal withdrawal of faith, and that, as Baumgarten (*Pentat.* i. 209) aptly expresses it, the profound secret of prayer is this, that man can prevail with the Divine Being, then we shall understand that this dark cloud need only be removed, and Job again stands before the God of love as His saint" (Del.).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The survey given above (No. 2 *a–f*) of those portions of the preceding section having the greatest doctrinal and ethical value will show where the most fruitful themes for homiletic discussion may be found. In any case the separate treatment of these themes commends itself in proportion to the richness of their contents and their high significance, in preference to the homiletic treatment of the whole discourse through all its length as a unit. If a comprehensive text is sought for, either one of the three sections, into which the whole discourse is divided, may be chosen. Or combining the first two sections into one of greater length, the division by chapters may be followed. In this case the theme of a homily on ch. ix. might run: "The saint of the Old Testament groaning under the pressure of the Divine omnipotence, not having as yet the consciousness of an atonement." The theme for ch. x. might be stated: "The pious sufferer of the Old Testament on the brink of despair," or "wavering between a child-like, thankful, trustful recognition of the Father-love of God (vers. 8-12) and disconsolate complaint because of His apparent merciless severity."—As shorter texts the following present themselves: ch. ix. 2-12—God's Omnipotence; ch. ix. 13-24—The apparent injustice of the Divine government of the world; ch. ix. 25-35—The cheerless and helpless condition of the suffering righteous under the Old Dispensation, who as yet knew no mediator between God and men; ch. x. 1-7—The contradiction which shows itself between the fact of God's omniscience, and that of the innocent suffering of the godly; ch. x. 8-12.—God's fatherly love, and His merciful all-including care as exhibited in the creation and preservation of human life; ch. x. 13-22.—God as the hostile persecutor of the sufferer, who fancies himself to be forsaken by Him, and who is deprived of all earthly comfort.

Particular Passages.

Ch. ix. 5 sq.: OECOLAMPADIUS: The levelling of mountains, the shakings of the earth, eclipses of the sun and of the stars, and in short the movements of the universe are testimonies to

the power of God. It must needs be that He is mighty who hurls mountains into the sea with such ease, that it is scarcely noticed. . . . Hence believers derive the hope that nothing is so terrible or so grievous but God can alleviate it, especially when He says: "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove" (Matt. xvii. 20). By which saying it is testified that the highest power belongs to those who believe.—STARKE: If God has the power to remove mountains, He certainly has the power to deliver out of all troubles (Ps. l. 25).—The heavens are a mirror of the infinite and incomprehensible Wisdom, Goodness and Omnipotence of God. Even the heathen have learned from their reflections, that there must be a supreme intelligent Being, who rules over all. Every star is our schoolmaster, and testifies to us that there is a God.

Ch. ix. 10 sq. BRENTIUS: God's judgments are hidden: at first sight they seem to men either unjust or foolish, but in the end His counsel is understood, and His back is seen, though not His face (Jer. xviii. 17). . . . Hence if God should pass before thee, *i. e.* if He should carry on some wondrous work before thine eyes, although at first thou shouldst be ignorant what it is, or what He wills by His wonderful work, nevertheless thou canst not doubt in the least that He is good and wise and just.—TUEBING. BIBLE: God as omnipresent is continually around us and with us, although we see Him not.—OSIANDER: Although God is without the least varying disposed towards us as a Father, it may nevertheless seem to us in trouble as though He had changed towards us (Ps. lxvii. 10; Is. lxiv. 16).

Ch. ix. 21 sq. ZEYSS: Although it seems to pious believers when in deep affliction and trial, as though God observed no measure and no discrimination in the infliction of punishment, it is nevertheless not so with Him; but such thoughts proceed from flesh and blood, yea, they are temptations of Satan (comp. Brentius above, Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks, No. 2).—HENGSTENBERG: To this result (*viz.* of regarding God as the author of evil and as absolutely unjust) we must come in our investigation of evil, if we look at the subject with carnal eyes. The matter looks differently, however, to him who is capable of spiritual discernment, which is true only of him who can bring his own processes and experiences into accord with God's justice. He sees that the triumph of evil is always only apparent and transient, only the means of preparing the way for the triumph of the good. He sees that the righteous need suffering for temptation and purification, that so long as sin dwells in them, they cannot yet be exalted to glory, but that, as the Apostle says of himself, they must be "troubled on every side, yet not distressed" (2 Cor. iv. 8); otherwise they would soon be a dead reed. "The staff of affliction beats our loins down to the grave," *etc.*, *etc.*

Ch. ix. 30 seq. ŒCOLAMPADIUS: The most potent kind of comfort is that which comes from a pure conscience, which is as it were a perpetual outcry. But neither from that do we derive any benefit, if we look back at our works. For we shall never thus be purified, who in the strict judgment of God would be pronounced abominable, and defiled with filth.—ZEYSS: The guilt of sin can be washed away by no snow-water, lye, or soap, *i. e.*, by no outward works, or self-elected service of God, or papistic holy water. It is quite another washing that serves for that, to wit, the blood of Jesus Christ; 1 John i. 7.

Ch. ix. 33. ŒCOLAMPADIUS: Without Christ we are such creatures as Job has described above. If however Christ is our arbiter and mediator (1 Tim. ii. 5) He Himself will remove the rod.

Ch. x. 2 seq. HENGSTENBERG: The needless and aimless cruelty towards an innocent person, of which Job accuses God, seems all the more inexcusable if this innocent one is at the same time wholly helpless. It would be revolting to see omnipotence sporting with impotence.—To such cheerless results are we driven, when, like Job, we look into ourselves as into a golden cup. If in severe suffering we fail to recognize our own darkness, the Father of Lights must change into darkness.

Ch. x. 8 seq. CRAMER: In affliction there is no better comfort than to remember that we are sprung from God (Ps. xxii. 10).—CHR. SCRIVER (in the hymn: "Jesu, meiner Seele Leben"):

"Thy loving-kindness was around me flung,
Ere yet the world did lie around my way;
On Thee in my weak infancy I hung,
While helpless on my mother's breast I lay.

. . . .

Along the wayward paths of early youth
Thy loving-kindness ever followed me.

. . . .

It is in Thee each moment I do live,
Thy Spirit ever with me doth abide;
All that I have is but what Thou dost give,
Thy light has ever been my journey's guide."

HENGSTENBERG: It is worthy of note, what a fund of knowledge of God Job still possesses, even when he seems to have completely forsaken God. With one who is penetrated, as he is, by the consciousness that every whiff of breath belongs to God, faith must, sooner or later, fight its way through all temptations and dark clouds.

Ch. x. 13 seq. CRAMER: God does not afflict and trouble men willingly (Lam. iii. 33), and although in affliction He seems to frown, He yet smiles on us in His heart. He stands behind the wall, and looks through the lattice; Cant. ii. 9.—HENGSTENBERG: Nothing tends more strongly to lead human nature astray, than the discovery that one whom you have been accustomed to love and to honor as your benefactor, has used his beneficence only as means to gratify the deepest malignity. Job thinks that his experience in relation to God is of this character. How under such circumstances must the Fountain of all consolation be changed into a poisonous spring!

Ch. x. 18 seq. OSIANDER: It is great ingratitude if we do not thank God for the use of light in this life; and it is a heathenish speech to say—it were best never to have been born, or to have died immediately after birth.—ZEYSS (on ver. 20 seq.): Terrible as are death and the grave to natural eyes, they are no less sweet and comforting to the eyes of faith (Luke ii. 29;

Phil. i. 21).—Starke: Those who are tried are wont to long greatly that God, if He will not altogether remove their suffering, would yet send some relief (Isa. xxxviii. 14).—Vict. Andreae: Do we not see in these two chapters (ix. and x.) how the human heart in truth wavers to and fro between the proudest presumption and the most pusillanimous despair?

III. Zophar and Job: Chaps. XI—XIV.

A.—Zophar's violent arraignment of Job, as one who needs in penitence to submit himself to the all-seeing and righteous God:

Chapter XI.

1. Expression of the desire that the Omniscient One would appear to convince Job of his guilt.

Vers. 2–6.

1 Then answered Zophar the Naamathite, and said:

2 Should not the multitude of words be answered?
and should a man full of talk be justified?
3 Should thy lies make men hold their peace?
and when thou mockest, shall no man make thee ashamed?
4 For thou hast said, My doctrine is pure,
and I am clean in Thine eyes.

5 But oh that God would speak,
and open His lips against thee;
6 and that He would show thee the secrets of wisdom,
that they are double to that which is!
Know therefore that God exacteth of thee less than thine iniquity deserveth.

2. Admonitory description of the impossibility of contending against God's omniscience, which charges every man with sin:

Verses 7–12.

7 Canst thou by searching find out God?
canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?
8 It is as high as heaven, what canst thou do?
deeper than hell, what canst thou know?
9 The measure thereof is longer than the earth,
and broader than the sea.

10 If He cut off, and shut up,
or gather together, then who can hinder Him?
11 For He knoweth vain men;
He seeth wickedness also; will He not then consider it?
12 For vain man would be wise,
though man be born like a wild ass's colt.

3. The truly penitent has in prospect the restoration of his prosperity; for the wicked, however, there remains no hope:

Verses 13–20.

13 If thou prepare thine heart,
and stretch out thine hands toward Him;
14 if iniquity be in thine hand, put it far away,
and let not wickedness dwell in thy tabernacles.

15 For then shalt thou lift up thy face without spot;
yea, thou shalt be steadfast, and shalt not fear.

16 Because thou shalt forget thy misery,
and remember it as waters that pass away;
17 and thine age shall be clearer than the noonday;
thou shalt shine forth, thou shalt be as the morning.

18 And thou shalt be secure, because there is hope;
yea, thou shalt dig about thee, and thou shalt take thy rest in safety.
19 Also thou shalt lie down, and none shall make thee afraid;
yea, many shall make suit unto thee.
20 But the eyes of the wicked shall fail,
and they shall not escape,
and their hope shall be as the giving up of the ghost.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The comparative violence of this new arraignment of Job is to be explained by the fact that he in his last discourse had positively maintained his innocence, and had accused God quite openly and directly of injustice. Zophar, the youngest and the least considerate of the three friends, opposes him on this head with the declaration that God the All-wise and All-seeing, would observe in him, as in all men, enough of sin to justify the stern infliction of punishment on him (ver. 6). He indeed gives direct expression to the thought that the suffering which Job endured was well-deserved punishment for sin (ver. 11), that sincere repentance was required of him (ver. 14), and that on condition of such repentance could he hope for restoration to his former prosperity, that in any other case the sad doom of the wicked would surely be before him (ver. 20). ["In his first appearance he is hot, and eager, and peremptory, but widely more gentle and less coarse than hereafter. Eliphaz brings forward his earnest exhortation, overawed by its divine majesty, and trembling when he recollects how he received from heaven the truth which he utters f r Job's advantage. Bildad reposes not on revelation, but on the human consciousness. Zophar, the private dogmatist, and as such—having nothing to fall back on with dignity—the hottest and most intolerant, has only his own 'of course,' 'it cannot but be,' with which to silence his obstinate adversary." DAVIDSON.] His discourse falls into three divisions: 1. The expression of a desire for such a declaration from the All-wise God as would convince Job of his guilt (vers. 2-6); 2. A description intended to warn Job of God's exalted knowledge, by virtue of which He charges on every man his sins (vers. 7-12); 3. An inculcation of the necessity of repentance as the only condition of recovering his former prosperity (vers. 13-20). Parts 1 and 2 are Double Strophes, consisting of small strophes of three or two verses each. Part 3 contains three such shorter strophes or groups of verses.

2. *First Division, or Double Strophe.* The express on of the desire that the Omniscient One would appear to convince Job of his guilt (vers. 2–6).

First Strophe: Vers. 2-4. A censure of the high-flown and impenitent discourse of Job.

Ver. 2. **Shall the multitude of words** (רֹב דְּבָרִים, as in Prov. x. 19; Eccles. v. 2) **remain unanswered, or shall a babbler** (lit. "man of lips," אִישׁ שְׂפָתַיִם, to be distinguished from אִישׁ דְּבָרִים, "a man of words," *i. e.*, an eloquent speaker, Ex. iv. 10) **be in the right?**—יִצְדָּק, literally "to be justified, to be declared in the right," to wit, by allowing him the last word. The beginning of the discourse resembles that of Bildad, chap. viii. 2. At the same time there may be detected a slight tone of apology, that the speaker undertakes to say any thing, notwithstanding his youth. ["If Zophar's name, which signifies *chirper* or *chatterer*, was expressive of his character, these words might have been applied to himself." WORDSWORTH.]

Ver. 3. **Shall thy vain talk** (בַּדִּים from בדד, *βαττολογεῖν*) [E. V: too strong, "li s," rather chatter, idle babbling] **put men** (מְתִים, archaic expression for אדם or אנשים ["like other archaisms, *e. g.*, תֵּבֵל, always without the article." DEL.], comp. ver. 11; chap. xix. 19; xxii. 15, *etc.*) **to silence, so that thou mockest** ["God (Hirzel); better Rosenmüller: *nos et Deum.*" DEL.], **without any one putting thee to shame?** *viz.*, by refuting thee.—The *fut. consec.* וַתִּלְעַג, as also ותאמר at the beginning of the following verse, denotes that into which Job might be betrayed by men's silence. It bears, therefore, since the principal verb יַחֲרִישׁוּ continues the question of the preceding verse, a modal impress: "so that thou darest to mock and to say," *etc.* (so correctly Umbreit, Hirzel, Vaihinger, Hahn, Delitzsch, *etc.*, while Ewald, Stickel, Dillmann [Carey], *etc.* remove altogether the interrogative character of our verse, and make it to consist of two co-ordinate affirmative clauses.

Ver. 4. **My doctrine is pure.**—לֶקַח, in the Book of Job occurring only here, very common, however, in Proverbs (comp. also Deut. xxxii. 2; Isa. xxix. 24), signifies not a mere "assumption," or "opinion" (Hahn), but something appropriated from tradition, a truth taught in accordance with tradition, especially in respect to moral conduct, therefore, in brief, moral teaching, or doctrine in general. With regard, there-

fore, to this his doctrine, the substance of his moral axioms and rules of living, Zophar reproaches Job with maintaining (or rather he says that he *would* maintain, if encouraged by the silence of others): "it is pure," *i. e.*, it is immaculate and infallible (זַךְ as in chap. viii. 6; xxxiii. 9; Prov. xvi. 2, *etc.*). And yet more than this: even against God would he maintain that "he was pure in His eyes" (comp. chap. ix. 21; x. 7). He would therefore, in addition to the purity of his principles, maintain also that of his life, a result which seems to Zophar the height of absurdity, and which seems to him to mock every holy ordinance of God.

Second Strophe: Vers. 5–6. Expression of the wish that God Himself might personally interpose to punish Job's arrogant falsehoods.

Ver. 5. **But oh that Eloah would speak and open His lips against thee.**—After מִי יִתֵּן here follows first the Infinitive (as in Ex. xvi. 3); then, however, in *b*, and in the following verse Imperfects: comp. GESEN. § 136, 2. [The subject of the Inf. is emphatically placed before it. "Oh, that *Eloah* would speak!" See EWALD, § 329, *c.*] A forcible וְאוּלָם (*verum enim vero*) introduces the whole optative clause and puts it, in a measure, in opposition to the wish that God might come, previously uttered by Job himself (chap. ix. 34 seq.), thus: verily, would He but come, there would be an immediate end to thy boasting.

Ver. 6. **And make known to thee the secrets of His wisdom, that it is twofold in true knowledge.**—תּוּשִׁיָּה in a somewhat different sense from that found above in chap. v. 12; vi. 13; here in a more theoretic (scientific) sense. כִּפְלַיִם, lit. that which is doubled, *i. e.*, in general that which is much greater than something else, which far surpasses it [hence "manifold" would, according to our mode of expression, be more exact than "twofold." The explanation of some that the word is used here by way of comparison, as though the meaning were that "God's wisdom is double thine," or "twice as great as thou canst imagine," is inadequate. The word is absolute, and although dual in form, is to us plural, or intensive in meaning= God's wisdom is fold upon fold! how then canst thou presume to judge it, as though able to see through it? For this intensive use of the dual comp. צָהֳרַיִם, ver. 17, lit. "double brightness," *i. e.*, the superlative brightness of noonday.—E.].

Comp. Isa. xl. 2. The subj. of כפלים, *viz.*, היא referring back to חכמה, is here omitted, because it is identical with the obj. of the principal clause; comp. Gen. ii. 4; Isa. iii. 10 (EWALD, § 336, *b*). [E. V. here—"that they are double to that which is"—is scarcely intelligible.] **So must thou know** [וְדַע, Imperat. consec., presenting the necessary consequence of the fulfilment of that wish; comp. EWALD, § 347, *a*) [Delitzsch: "Instead of saying: then thou wouldst perceive, Zophar, realizing in his mind that which he has just wished, says imperiously וְדַע"] **that Eloah remits to thee of thy guilt**—*i. e.*, leaves much of it out of the account against thee, lets it go unpunished. The מִן in מֵעֲוֹנֶךָ is accordingly partitive, to be expressed by "somewhat of, much of," הִשָּׁה, lit. to bring into forgetfulness, *oblivioni dare*, a causative Hiphil, occurring elsewhere in the O. T. only in chap. xxxix. 17.

3. *Second Division, or Double Strophe:* Describing, with an admonitory purpose, the impossibility of contending against God's omniscience, which charges every man with sin, vers. 7–12.

First Strophe: Vers. 7–9. [God's wisdom unsearchable.]

Ver. 7. **Canst thou reach the depths** [in the Germ.: *den Grund erreichen;* lit. to reach the bottom] **in Eloah, or penetrate to the uttermost parts** [*zum Aeussersten hinandringen*] **in the Almighty?**—חֵקֶר, "search" (chap. viii. 8), is used here *sensu objectivo*=that which is to be searched, the ground of any thing (so in chap. xxxviii. 16); here, therefore, the hidden depth [ground, basis] of the divine nature. תַּכְלִית, on the contrary, denotes "the finishing, the terminus," *i. e.*, the end, the extremity of the same divine nature [Wordsworth: "canst thou arrive at the limit of God? Canst thou attain to the horizon of the Almighty?"] (comp. ch. xxvi. 10; xxviii. 3; Ps. cxxxix. 22; Nehem. iii. 21). The first question accordingly describes God as unfathomable, the second as illimitable or immeasurable; the former conveys the notion of absolute mystery, the latter that of absolute greatness and incomprehensibility. ["The nature of God may be sought after, but cannot be found out; and the end of God is unattainable, for He is both: the Perfect One, *absolutus;* and the Endless One, *infinitus.*" DEL.] Many moderns, after Eichhorn (*e. g.*, John Pye Smith: *The Scripture Testimony of the Messiah*, 6 Ed., Vol. I 11; Vol. II. 240) [also E. V.] take חקר in the active sense of searching or discovering, and תכלית in the sense of perfection. This, however, yields for both members a less suitable sense, and assigns to תכלית a signification which it can nowhere be proved to have. [Conant and others (so also E. V.) regard the clause עַד־תַּכְלִית as adverbial: "Canst thou find out the Almighty to a perfection?" *i. e.*, to a perfect comprehension of Him. Neither of Conant's reasons for this rendering is valid. (1) The parallelism does not favor it, but contrariwise. חֵקֶר אֱלוֹ׳ finds its parallel in תַּכְ׳ שַׁ׳; the former belonging to the category of depth, the latter to that of length, which accounts for the preposition עַד. (2) The accentuation does not favor it, but the reverse. Munach puts שַׁדַּי in precisely the same connection with the final verb in this member, as אֱלוֹהַּ in the former member.—E.]

Ver. 8. **Heights of heaven:** to wit, are the distances which lie between our perception and

the "extremity" of the Almighty, the dimensions with which we seek to measure His infinitude. Hence the question, vividly annexed to this exclamation—**what canst thou do?**—emphasizing the helplessness and powerlessness of man over against that which is immeasurable. To this corresponds the second member:—**deeper than the underworld** (are the hidden depths, the grounds of the Godhead, or of the Divine Wisdom)—**what knowest thou?** what can thy knowledge do in view of such depths? In so far as the phrase "heights of heaven" points back to the idea of the תַּכְלִית, while the phrase "deeper than the underworld" points to that of the חֵקֶר, the position of the two members of this verse seems to be inverted as regards those of the ver. preceding. It is to be observed that the ruling idea here, as well as in the following verse, is throughout that of the Divine *wisdom* (omniscience), or the Divine nature on the side of *wisdom and intellectual perfection*, as the connection of the passage with ver. 6 clearly shows.

Ver. 9. **Longer than the earth is its measure, and broader is it than the sea**: *viz.* the Divine wisdom, the immeasurableness of which is here described according to all the four dimensions, according to the height and depth, and also according to the length and breadth, as in Eph. iii. 18 these same four dimensions are used in describing the absoluteness of the love of God in Christ. Our translation: "longer than the earth is its [lit. her] measure," rests on the reading מִדָּהּ with He mappiq, which is to be regarded as an abbreviated feminine form for מִדָּתָהּ (comp. ch. v. 13, עָרְמָם for עָרְמָתָם: also Zech. iv. 2, *etc.*). The Masorah, indeed, favors מִדָּה, with He raphatum, with which reading the word would be the Accus. of nearer definition ("according to its measure, in measure"). But the separation between the Accus. of relation and its ruling word produced by a word intervening, would give here, where הִיא is omitted, a somewhat harsh construction, to which the simpler rendering given above is to be preferred.

Second Strophe: vers. 10-12. [The judicial intervention of God supposed.]

Ver. 10. **If He passes by** [יַחֲלֹף, as in ch. ix. 11; E. V. incorrectly "cut off"], **and arrests, and calls to judgment** (lit. summons an assembly, implying that the process of a trial was public, and the verdict rendered and executed by the assembled people: comp. Ezek. xvi. 40; xxiii. 46; 1 Kings xxi. 9). ["One might almost imagine that Zophar looks upon himself and the other two friends as forming such an 'assembly:' they cannot justify him in opposition to God, since He accounts him guilty." Del.]—**Who will oppose Him?** present a protest in behalf of the accused as though he were not guilty. Comp. in general ch. ix. 11, 12, which description of Job's Zophar here reproduces in part word for word, but with quite another purpose, *viz.* to defend, not to condemn or assail God's justice ["וּמִי *vav* apod. with fine effect—*who, as you say* (ix. 12) *would?*" Dav.].

Ver. 11. **For He** [emphatic, הוּא; whether others know it, or not] **knows evil men** (מְתֵי שָׁוְא, lit. "men of vanity, of falsehood," ["people who hypocritically disguise their moral nothingness." Del.], as in Ps. xxvi. 4; comp. also Job xxii. 15), **and sees wickedness without considering it**: *i. e.* without watching it with strenuous and anxious strictness (comp. ch. xxxiv. 23), the moral qualities of His creatures being at every moment unveiled to His omniscience. ["Finely magnifying the Divine Insight, which is omniscient, and is so without effort." Dav.] This is the only rendering of וְלֹא יִתְבּוֹנָן which accords with the context (comp. already Aben Ezra; *non opus habet, ut diu consideret;* among moderns Hirzel, Dillm., Del., *etc.*). Far less natural are the explanations of Ewald: "without his (the wicked) observing it;" of Umbreit, Stickel, Hahn: "without his (the wicked) being observed;" of Schlottman: "and (sees) him who observes not, who is without understanding."

Ver. 12. **So must (even) a witless man acquire wisdom, and a wild ass's foal be born over a man.**—This interpretation, which is the one substantially adopted by Piscator, Umbreit, Ewald, Schlottm., Vaih., Heiligst., Dillmann [Renan, Hengst., Wordsworth], and generally by most moderns, is the most suitable among the numerous interpretations of this difficult verse. The connection by the וְ with the verse preceding, shows that this verse should indicate what effect the judicial intervention of the Omniscient God ought to have on man, even though he be a stubborn sinner and devoid of understanding.—אִישׁ נָבוּב, lit. a man bored through, *i. e.* a hollow man, hence one void of understanding, a man without intellectual and moral substance; comp. the phrase מְתֵי שָׁוְא.—Again, עַיִר פֶּרֶא (of which פֶּרֶא is in apposition, not in the genitive), signifies lit. "a foal, a wild ass, *i. e.*, a wild-ass-foal (comp. the phrase פֶּרֶא אָדָם, used in almost the same sense of untamed wildness in Gen. xvi. 12).—Both these expressions, as well as those of the preceding verse, are chosen not without reference to the conduct of Job, who seems to Zophar to be an obstinate fool (comp. ch. ii. 10); although not pointed directly at him, they inflict on him a sensible cut [see ch. xii. 3, where with evident reference to the יִלָּבֵב of this passage, Job with indignant scorn says גַּם־לִי לֵבָב כְּ׳—E.], and they at the same time facilitate the transition to the following admonitions. Observe also the intentional and witty paronomasia [both of sound and sense] between נָבוּב and יִלָּבֵב: the empty man is to be made a man of substance [*der Hohlkopf soll beherzt gemacht*], the void in his head is to be filled up as it were by a new heart. [Observe in addition the assonance of the closing words of each member, יִלָּבֵב and יִוָּלֵד.—Davidson adopts essentially the same construction of terms and clauses as that given here, but gives to the verse a different *tone*. Instead of regarding it as a

grave declaration of what should be the result of the judicial intervention of God, he regards it as a sarcastic denial of wisdom to man:—"*But a witless man would be wise, and a wild ass colt be a born man!* a man who is a fool would arrogate wisdom to himself, and though a wild ass colt, he would claim humanity." This, however, would be a tone of remark entirely out of harmony with what precedes, and with what follows. Davidson characterizes the interpretation adopted above as "excessively artificial and unhebraistic in construction:" a strange charge surely to come from one who adopts the *very same construction*, except that he gives it a different coloring. Equally wide of the mark is the objection that Job himself did not exhibit the result which Zophar here says ought or might be expected to follow.—Hengstenberg remarks on the contents of the verse according to our interpretation: "We have here the first passage of Scripture which speaks of a regeneration."—E.] The following varying explanations are to be rejected as being in part against the connection, in part too harsh, or grammatically inadmissible. 1. "An empty man is without heart," *i. e.* without understanding, *etc.* (Gesenius, Olshausen), [Conant, Noyes, Merx, Rodwell.—Against this it may be argued that such a privative use of *Niphal* is unexampled in Hebrew, and especially as Dillmann urges, that the sentiment thus expressed is self-evident and trite, and takes away the whole force of the paronomasia].—2. "But man, like a hollow pate, has he understanding," *etc.* (Hirzel). ["Violates the accentuation, and produces an affected witticism." DEL.]—3. "Man is—at his birth—as one empty furnished with a heart," *i. e.* he receives an empty undiscerning heart (Hupfeld). [Opposed to the *future* verbs, and to the correlation of נבוב and ילבב].—4. "Ignorant man flares up, or becomes insolent, *etc.*" (Vulgate, Stickel, Welte [Carey], *etc.* [Does not bring out the proper antithesis between נבוב and ילבב. Why should the man of whom it is affirmed that he has a bold defiant heart be described as נָבוּב? This meaning is, moreover, less suitable to the connection. See remarks below at the end of the verse.—The same objections apply to] 5. "An empty man becomes stubborn" (Böttcher).—6. "Before an empty head gains a heart (understanding), a wild ass's foal will be born again a man" (Rosenm., Hahn, Del., Kamphausen, *etc.*)

[In determining the meaning of this difficult expression the following considerations should have controlling weight. (1) The evident antithesis of נבוב and ילבב. Now as נבוב can be referred only to man in his sinful hollowness, emptiness, ילבב must describe the opposite, or man as endowed with a heart to understand, appreciate, and profit by God's dealings. (2) The assonance of יִלָּבֵב and יִוָּלֵד, as well as the striking homogeneousness of thought between the two terms, the one describing the process of endowing man with לֵב, the distinguishing characteristic of manhood, the other the process of *becoming* a man, being born, here being born again a man, suggests that the verse is most probably a synonymous parallelism, the same essential thought being repeated in both members. (3) The *gravity* of the connection forbids our regarding the verse as simply a piece of witty irony. The verses preceding are a solemn description of God's procedure against man in judgment; the verses following a solemn appeal to Job to repent and return to God. This verse in like manner is far more likely to be a grave earnest affirmation of truth than the opposite. (4) The *practical* drift of the connection makes it probable that the verse is not a description of the sinner in his perversity, but in the possibilities of his restoration. As the result of God's severe disciplinary processes "empty man *may* or *should* be filled with a heart, and a wild ass's foal may or should be born over a man." This being the case, if *thou* direct thine heart, *etc.*, thou shalt lift up thy face without spot, *etc.* Thus understood, it will be seen that the verse furnishes a suitable sequel to vers. 10, 11, and a suitable preparation to ver. 13 seq.—(5) It seems exceedingly probable to say the least, that Job's language in ch. xii. 3 *a* is his direct reply to the implied reproach in this verse. There he claims that he *has* לבב as well as the friends, a claim which is most satisfactorily explained by supposing that he was stung to make it by understanding Zophar's language here to imply that he needed to be put in possession of לבב.—E.].

4 *Third Division:* An admonition to repentance and conversion as the only means by which Job can recover his former prosperity, and escape the terrible doom of the wicked: vers. 13-20.

First Strophe: Vers. 13–15. A period, consisting of ver. 13 as hypothetical antecedent, ver. 15 as consequent, and ver. 14 as a regularly constructed parenthesis.

Ver. 13. (But) **if thou direct thy heart** (prepare it, bring it into a proper condition, not: "give it the right direction towards God," Del. and others; nor again: "establish it," Hirzel ["not pertinent, because Zophar has not in his mind so much *perseverance* in godliness as a return to it," Dav.]), **and spread forth thy hands unto Him,** *viz.*, in prayer and penitent supplication for mercy; comp. ch. viii. 5, and for the same phrase פרשׂ כפים. *manus supinas* (*palmas*) *extendere*, comp. Ex. ix. 29, 33; 1 Kings viii. 22; Isa. i. 15.

Ver. 14. **If iniquity is in thy hand, put it far away, and let not evil dwell in thy tents** (comp. ch. v. 24); this being the antecedent condition of the success of Job's prayer according to Zophar's mode of thinking, which indeed is not in itself a theory of legality or work-righteousness (comp. Ps. xxxiv. 13 (12) seq.; 1 Pet. iii. 10; Isa. i. 15 seq.), but which in the present case does nevertheless proceed from a narrow judgment, and is excessively offensive to Job.

Ver. 15. **Surely, then thou shalt lift up thy face** (comp. on ch. x. 15) **without spot:** *i. e.*, "without consciousness of guilt, and without any outward sign of the same cleaving to

thee," (Dillm.) מִן lit. "away from," here equivalent to "without," comp. ch. xix. 26; xxi. 9; 2 Sam. i. 22; Prov. xx. 3; **and shalt be steadfast without fearing**; shalt be firmly fixed in thy new prosperity, without having to fear any further judgments of God.—מֻצָק, Part. Hoph. of יצק, lit. fused into solidity, *quasi ex ære fusus* (comp. 1 Kings vii. 16. ["We must not lose the fine idea of one state arising out of another, a state of fluidity מַם ch. vi. 14) passing over into solidity; playing on Job's past and future." Dav.].

Second Strophe: Vers. 16, 17. Continuation of the promise of well-being to the penitent.

Ver. 16. **For thou shalt forget trouble, shalt remember it as waters that have passed away**: as something therefore that is never to come back, that has disappeared forever. ["When we think of water that has flowed away, we think of it as something which does not return, or rather we think no more about it at all, for with its disappearance even the remembrance of it is gone." Dillmann]. The pronoun here is emphatic: "for *thou thyself* wilt forget trouble, thou and none other, no stranger (comp. ch. xix. 27) [or, as Davidson: "*thou*, unlike others, who escape calamity, but are haunted by its memory;" or, as Hengst: "*thou*, who just now canst think no other thought than of thy suffering"]: giving "an emphasis to the personal application of this peroration," which would be lost if, with the Pesh. and Hirzel, כִּי אַתָּה were changed to כִּי עַתָּה.

Ver. 17. **And brighter than the glory of noon** (צהרים, as in ch. v. 14 *b*) **arises** (for thee) **the future.** חֶלֶד, lit. that which creeps along slowly, which passes by unobserved (from חלד, to glide) hence *time* in general, either in the sense of the world, that which is temporal, *αἰών* (Ps. xvii. 14; comp. Hupfeld on the passage, Ps. xlix. 2); or in the sense of life, lifetime, future, as here and in Ps. xxxix. 6 (5); lxxxix. 48 (47), *etc.* ["יָקוּם, an exquisite image, lift itself up, *disentangle* itself from the accumulated, crushing darkness of the present, increasing in brilliancy ever as it disengages itself." Dav.]. For מִן in מִצָּהֳרַיִם, (with "brighter" to be supplied) comp. Mic. vii. 4.—**Should it be dark, it will be as the morning**; *i. e.*, if any darkness should come, if dark adversity should befall thee (תָּעֻפָה, 3d Pers. Fem., with neut. signification: not 2d Pers., "shouldest thou become dark," as Schlottm. would explain) it will then ever be as bright as on a clear morning: evidently an intentional reversal of the gloomy picture of his future in ch. x. 22, which Job had himself drawn. ["His climax there was that his daylight should be as darkness; Zophar's promise is that his darkness shall be daylight." Dav.—Gesenius (in Thes.) Ewald, Conant, *etc.*, prefer taking תעפה as a noun, "darkness," written תְּעֻפָה, or תְּעוּפָה, as found in a few MSS., and as read by the Syr. and Chald.—Bernard, Hengstenberg, and others render the verb—"thou shalt fly up," *i. e.*, soar out of the depths of thy misery to the heights of prosperity; a rendering which destroys the antithesis between this verse and ch. x. 22.—E. V.: "thou shalt shine forth" seems to be a paraphrase of this last rendering, suggested perhaps by the frequent comparison of the beams of light to the wings of a bird.—E.]

Third Strophe: Vers. 18–20. Conclusion of the promise of prosperity, with an admonitory reference to the joyless end of the wicked.

Ver. 18. **And thou hast** (thou shalt have, Perf. consec.) **confidence, because there is** [יֵשׁ, "with the force of a real and lasting existence," Del.] **hope** (for thee, comp. ch. xiv. 7, also the opposite of this hopeful condition described above in ch. vii. 6); **and thou shalt search about** (to ascertain, *viz.*, whether all that pertains to thy household is in a state of order and security; comp. ch. v. 24 *b*), **shalt lie down securely**, *viz.*, for sleep; comp. Ps. iv. 9 (8). חָפַר here certainly "to spy out," as in ch. xxxix. 21, 29; not "to blush (חָפֵר), to be ashamed," as though וְחָפַרְתָּ were a concessive antecedent clause: "and even shouldest thou be put to shame (in thy confidence), thou canst still lie down in peace," Rosenm., Hirzel, [Carey], an unsuitable weakening of the sense, which is at variance with the remainder of the bright promises contained in these verses. ["Against this conditional sense is the affirmative use of the corresponding form in the parallel member." Con. "It is inadmissible, since it introduces a sadness into the promise." Del.]. The rendering of Hengstenberg is altogether too artificial: "and thou hast *dug*," *i. e.*, dug a trench for protection around thy house [and so E. V.—"thou shalt dig about thee"], a sense which the reference to ch. iii. 21; xxxix. 21 is scarcely sufficient to justify.

Ver. 19. **Thou liest down without any one making thee afraid**; as peacefully and securely, that is, as the beast, or the cattle, which no foe terrifies; comp. Gen. xlix. 9; Isa. xvii. 2.—**Yea, many shall seek thy favor**, lit. stroke, or caress thy face (Del. "thy cheeks") flatter thee; comp. Prov. xix. 6; Ps. xlv. 13 (12). Instead of being despised, and covered with ignominy, (ch. x. 15) thou shalt be highly honored, and greatly courted.

Ver. 20. **But the eyes of the wicked waste away**, in vainly looking for help, in unsatisfied yearning for good (comp. ch. xvii. 5) **and every refuge vanishes from them**; lit. "away from them," מִנְהֶם poet. for מֵהֶם; **and their hope is the breathing out of the soul;** *i. e.*, all that they have still to hope for is the breathing out of their soul (comp. נַפַּח נֶפֶשׁ ch. xxxi. 39; Jer. xv. 9), hence the giving up of the ghost, *death* (not a state where their desires will remain eternally unfulfilled, as Delitzsch explains.) ["Zophar here makes use of the choicest expressions of the style of the prophetic Psalms," Delitzsch. "If we compare with each other the closing words of the three friends, ch. v. 26 sq.; viii. 22 *b*; xi. 20, the advance, which each makes beyond his predecessor, is unmistakable." Dillmann.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. This first discourse of Zophar's resembles that of Eliphaz, and still more that of Bildad, both in respect of the rebuke with which it begins ("who can hear such words in silence?" *etc.*) and in respect of the union of promise and warning at the close. It proceeds from the same theological and ethical premises as those of the two previous speakers, in so far as it puts God's absolute perfection and exaltation (here more particularly on the intellectual side, the illimitability of His knowledge and His wisdom) in solemn and emphatic contrast with the short-sighted limitation of man, and thence derives man's obligation in all circumstances to draw nigh to God as a penitent, and to confess himself before Him as guilty and deserving of punishment. Not less does it resemble those two preceding arraignments of Job in respect of form, in the strength of its expressions, in the poetic loftiness and figurative richness of its descriptions, qualities which shine forth with especial brilliancy in the passage where the Divine wisdom is described as being high as heaven, deep as hell, long as the earth, and broad as the sea (vers. 7–9). Moreover the comparatively correct orthodoxy of its positions and arguments, the absence of everything that would decidedly contradict the doctrinal and ethical tradition of pious Old Testament worshippers of Jehovah (worshippers of Eloah), the circumstance that nowhere is there even any excessive work-righteousness and legal harshness visible (particularly not in ver. 14)—all this exhibits Zophar to us as a kindred soul with Eliphaz and Bildad. and his stand-point as most intimately related to theirs.

2. That, however, which marks the difference between this discourse, as to its contents and tendency, and those of the two former speakers—a difference, too. which is not to the advantage of the speaker—is its *tone*, which is immeasurably *more violent*. Its attack on the sorely tried sufferer, who so greatly needed a merciful and tender treatment, is harsher, more pointed and personal. At the very beginning (vers. 2-3) the bitter charge is hurled at his head that his speech was "a torrent of words" and "empty talk." To the expression "an empty pate," which is here applied to him, is added in vers. 11-12 a description of vain, hollow-pated, stubborn people (who are like the wild ass), which points with unmistakable significance to Job. And in the closing passage (ver. 20), which points out the hopeless destruction of the wicked, there is no trace of the delicacy and urbanity of his two predecessors, at the close of whose discourses, the tone of promise altogether predominates over that of threats and warnings. The discourse at this very point shows a decidedly perceptible advance beyond the two which precede towards inconsiderate harshness. "Eliphaz barely appended a slight warning; Bildad briefly blends it with his promise by way of contrast; Zophar adds a verse which already looks like the advanced picket of an army of similar harsh menaces in chs. xv., xviii., xx." (Ewald). Again, the exceedingly personal and unqualified way in which Zophâr in ver. 6 reproaches Job with his guilt, and suggests that there must be not a little of it that is overlooked by God, as well as the not less personal and humiliating demand that he should repent and renounce all unrighteousness as a *conditio sine qua non* of his restoration to divine favor (ver. 13 seq.) exhibit a certain advance on the part of this speaker beyond the stand-point of the two former. Instead of reckoning himself as belonging to those who need repentance and purification, as Eliphaz does very distinctly, and Bildad also, at least to some extent, Zophar, when he reminds Job of the duty of acknowledging his sins and repenting of them, speaks only in the second person. He thus sets himself up before him as a rigid censor and accuser, and assumes the character of an advocate of God, who himself needs no correction. As a consequence all that he says in the way of positive instruction, or produces out of the store of his monotheistic Chokmah-tradition, loses for Job its proper moral value and its determining power. Even the description of the abysmal vastness and unsearchableness of the Divine nature and intelligence in ver. 7 seq , grand as it is in itself, must seem cold to Job, and pass away without leaving any impression on him; for no softening ray of heartfelt brotherly love, and of a humble realization of grace falls on this magnificent picture of the Divine omniscience and wisdom. That picture can and should in truth produce only terror and trembling; for in whichever of the four directions we turn, whether toward the heights of heaven, or the depths of hell, or the lengths of the earth, or the breadths of the sea, nowhere do we discover any bridge hospitably inviting and facilitating our advance. We find no experience, not even a presentiment of the *love-power of Christ's cross*, which fills and pervades the abysmal depths of the divine nature. There is to be found as yet no trace of that knowledge of God, which Paul in Eph. iii. 18 describes as a "comprehending . . . what is the breadth and the length and the depth and the height:" a comprehension which indeed belongs only to the "saints" of the New Dispensation, which is produced only by the cross of the Redeemer as the solution of all contradictions (comp. also Eph. iv. 8-10), and which can be acquired and appropriated only at the feet of the Crucified One.* The

* It is a favorite thought of many of the Church Fathers that the Cross of Christ is a power which mediates and reconciles the discords and oppositions between all parts of the universe (as though accordingly it sent its roots down into the under-world, its head up into heaven, while with both arms it lovingly embraced the broad expanse of earth and air). This thought is elaborated for the most part in connection with Eph. iii. 18 (ch. iv. 8–10), but occasionally also with reference to Job xi. 8, 9. So by Basil the Great (comm. on Isai. ii.); by Gregory of Nyssa (*Catech. Magna*, c. 32); by Rufinus (*Expositio Symb. Apostolici*); by Coel. Sedulius (*Mirabilia Div.* V. 297, 54); by John of Damascus (*De fide orthod.* iv. 12), *etc.* The same may be said of many modern mystics and theosophists, such as Baader, St. Martin, Görres, J. F. v. Meyer. Comp. especially the last named's "*Blätter f. hohere Wahrheit*," Vol. VIII., page 145 seq.: "The Cross points upward and downward, to the right and to the left; this fourfold direction designates the *All*, on which and from which its influence acts. *Its head uplifts itself to the throne of God, and its root reaches down to hell. Its arms stretch out from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, from pole to pole.* In it heaven and earth are united, in it appeased; in it things which are most strongly opposed are

deficiency in this knowledge of God, which Zophar here exhibits is indeed on his part essentially not criminal, resting as it does on the fact that neither to him, nor to his associates, nor to Job himself, had the mystery of justification by faith been openly revealed as yet (comp. Brentius: "Zophar and the other friends of Job seem to be entirely ignorant of what the Gospel and faith in God's promise can effect; they argue against Job as though no one could ever be justified before God by faith"), and that as to his general position he belonged to that immature and imperfect stage of development in the education of the human race, when it was impossible as yet to advance beyond a rigid contra-position of the Godhead and the creature. He must, however, be to the last charged with criminal and guilty conduct in this, that he uses his insight into that heavenly immeasurable superiority of the Divine knowledge over the human (or, which is the same thing: his doctrine that the divine wisdom represents all men as sinful and foolish) with merciless severity against Job, deeply wounding him with it as with a sword, without making even a single attempt to soften the application, or to use this two-edged weapon in a considerate and conciliatory spirit.

3. It is easy to see accordingly what in Zophar's discourse must be censured as one-sided and unfriendly, and what on the other hand remains as really beautiful and valuable religious and moral truth. The latter is limited essentially to the inspired eulogy of the Divine wisdom and omniscience in ver. 7 seq.,—a description which in power and beauty is not, indeed, equal to that presented in the introductory part of Ps. cxxxix., but which furnishes nevertheless one of the most note-worthy Old Testament parallels of that passage. It is in the more detailed exhibition of the individual beauties and profound truths of this eulogy of Divine wisdom that we are principally to find the

reconciled and made one." Comp. also the remarks of Œcolampadius, Cocceius, *etc.*, cited below [Homiletical and Practical].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL

Suggestions of this Discourse.—It is neither necessary nor advisable to subdivide it in thus treating it. For as vers. 2–5 are simply introductory to the main theme, so vers. 13-20 show how the wisdom of the Most High, incomprehensible in itself, and His omniscience, can alone become comprehensible to man, thus furnishing the basis for the practical and hortatory part, in which every homily on such a theme as the present one must find its issue. The whole is to be left in its organic connection. The following hints however may serve for the treatment of particular passages.

Ver. 7. ŒCOLAMPADIUS: By the four greatest dimensions of the greatest things the idea of supreme perfection is conveyed. . . . Wisdom is higher than the heaven, deeper than hell, broader than the sea, and longer than the earth, for its greatness is not included within all of these. For the heaven of the heavens cannot contain Thee, says Solomon in his prayer (1 Ki. viii. 27).—COCCEIUS: It is no longer necessary that we should wish for one who might either ascend to heaven, or descend to hell, or depart beyond the sea. In Christ we have One who came from heaven, who returned from hell, who measures the earth and the sea with a span. In Him all things are open and clear to us.—STARKE: If man is not capable of searching out so many things in nature, how much less can he with his narrow understanding comprehend God's nature, and His wise government (Wisd. ix. 16)!—HENGSTENBERG (on ver. 10 seq.): It is here that we first see quite clearly in what respect Zophar asserts the claims of the Divine wisdom against Job, *as being that*, namely, *by virtue of which God penetrates the depths of the human heart and life, which to man himself are utterly inaccessible and hidden.* He in rendering His judgment has all facts and data at His control, whereas to man only a small part is accessible.

Ver. 13 seq. COCCEIUS: As there was impudence in the Pharisee's lifting up of his hands (Luke xviii. 11 seq.), so there is deception in the hypocrite's beating of the breast. These gestures easily degenerate. The best prayers are those which make the least noise, and which are poured out in the secret recesses of the heart to Him who seeth in secret, and rewardeth openly, who is the "Hearer of the heart, not of the voice," as Cyprian says.—STARKE: True penitence and believing prayer are the means by which calamity is warded off, and prosperity and blessing procured (Judith viii. 12 seq.) With true repentance, however, there must be associated (as in the case of Zacchæus, Luke xix. 8) an earnest purpose to reform the life.

Ver. 15 seq. BRENTIUS: What therefore shall be to the man who directs his own heart, who stretches out his hands toward God, and who purges his works of sin? He dares to lift up his face before God, without spot, without crime; for if conscience, sin, or Satan should accuse us it is God who justifies; it is Christ who died and rose again, and the Christian shall rise together with Him. . . . All these promises are fulfilled in the Church, in which by faith tears are wiped away, and mourning disappears (Rev. xxi. 4); the body indeed suffers pain, but the inward man is renewed day by day (2 Cor. iv. 16).

Ver. 20. STARKE: The Divine threatenings are to be applied to the soul that rests in careless security, but not to the soul that is tried with temptation and anguish (2 Thess. v 14).—HENGSTENBERG; Job had spoken of death as his only hope. Very true, says Zophar, it is the only hope, if thou remainest as thou art! Zophar is quite right in making all Job's hope, and all his salvation depend on his knowing himself as a sinner. His error begins only when he comes to determine more particularly the way and mode of recognizing sin, when—that is—he treats sinners and transgressors as convertible terms. In his sense Job could not acknowledge himself a sinner.

B.—Job's Reply: Attack upon his friends, whose wisdom and justice he earnestly questions:

CHAPTERS XII—XIV.

1. Ridicule of the assumed wisdom of the friends, who can give only a very unsatisfactory description of the exalted power and wisdom of the Divine activity:

CHAP. XII.

1 And Job answered and said,

2 No doubt but ye are the people,
and wisdom shall die with you.
3 But I have understanding as well as you;
I am not inferior to you;
yea, who knoweth not such things as these?
4 I am as one mocked of his neighbor,
who calleth upon God, and He answereth him;
the just, upright man is laughed to scorn!
5 He that is ready to slip with his feet
is as a lamp despised in the thought of him that is at ease.
6 The tabernacle of robbers prosper,
and they that provoke God are secure;
into whose hand God bringeth abundantly.

7 But ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee,
and the fowls of the air, and they shall tell thee:
8 or speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee,
and the fishes of the sea shall declare unto thee.
9 Who knoweth not in all these
that the hand of the Lord hath wrought this?
10 In whose hand is the soul of every living thing,
and the breath of all mankind.
11 Doth not the ear try words,
and the mouth taste his meat?
12 With the ancient is wisdom;
and in length of days understanding.

13 With Him is wisdom and strength,
He hath counsel and understanding.
14 Behold He breaketh down, and it cannot be built again;
He shutteth up a man, and there can be no opening.
15 Behold, He withholdeth the waters, and they dry up;
also He sendeth them out, and they overturn the earth,

16 With Him is strength and wisdom;
the deceived and the deceiver are His.
17 He leadeth counsellors away spoiled,
and maketh the judges fools.
18 He looseth the bond of kings,
and girdeth their loins with a girdle.

19 He leadeth princes away spoiled,
and overthroweth the mighty.

20 He removeth away the speech of the trusty,
and taketh away the understanding of the aged.
21 He poureth contempt upon princes,
and weakeneth the strength of the mighty.

22 He discovereth deep things out of darkness,
and bringeth out to light the shadow of death.
23 He increaseth the nations and destroyeth them;
He enlargeth the nations, and straighteneth them again.
24 He taketh away the heart of the chief of the people of the earth,
and causeth them to wander in a wilderness where there is no way.
25 They grope in the dark without light,
and He maketh them to stagger like a drunken man.

2. The resolution to betake himself to God, who, in contrast with the harshness and injustice of the friends will assuredly do him justice:

Chapter XIII. 1–22.

1 Lo, mine eye hath seen all this,
mine ear hath heard and understood it.
2 What ye know, the same do I know also;
I am not inferior unto you.
3 Surely I would speak to the Almighty,
and I desire to reason with God.
4 But ye are forgers of lies,
ye are all physicians of no value.
5 O that ye would altogether hold your peace,
and it should be your wisdom.
6 Hear now my reasoning,
and hearken to the pleadings of my lips.

7 Will ye speak wickedly for God,
and talk deceitfully for Him?
8 Will ye accept His person?
will ye contend for God?
9 Is it good that He should search you out?
or as one man mocketh another, do ye so mock Him?
10 He will surely reprove you,
if ye do secretly accept persons.
11 Shall not His excellency make you afraid?
and His dread fall upon you?
12 Your remembrances are like unto ashes,
your bodies to bodies of clay.

13 Hold your peace, let me alone that I may speak,
and let come on me what will.
14 Wherefore do I take my flesh in my teeth,
and put my life in mine hand?
15 Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him:
but I will maintain mine own ways before Him.
16 He also shall be my salvation:
for a hypocrite shall not come before Him.

17 Hear diligently my speech,
and my declaration with your ears.
18 Behold now, I have ordered my cause;
I know that I shall be justified.
19 Who is he that will plead with me?
for now, if I hold my tongue, I shall give up the ghost.

20 Only do not two things unto me;
then will I not hide myself from Thee.
21 Withdraw Thine hand far from me;
and let not Thy dread make me afraid.
22 Then call Thou, and I will answer:
or let me speak, and answer Thou me!

3. **A vindication of himself, addressed to God, beginning with the haughty asseveration of his own innocence, but relapsing into a despondent cheerless description of the brevity, helplessness, and hopelessness of man's life:**

CHAPTER XIII. 23—XIV. 22.

23 How many are mine iniquities and sins?
make me to know my transgression and my sin.
24 Wherefore hidest Thou Thy face,
and holdest me for Thine enemy?
25 Wilt Thou break a leaf driven to and fro?
and wilt Thou pursue the dry stubble?
26 For Thou writest bitter things against me,
and makest me to possess the iniquities of my youth.
27 Thou puttest my feet also in the stocks,
and lookest narrowly unto all my paths;
Thou settest a print upon the heels of my feet.
28 And he, as a rotten thing, consumeth,
as a garment that is moth-eaten.

CHAPTER XIV.

1 Man that is born of a woman,
is of few days, and full of trouble.
2 He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down;
he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not.
3 And dost Thou open Thine eyes upon such an one,
and bringest me into judgment with Thee?
4 Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?
not one!
5 Seeing his days are determined,
the number of his months are with Thee,
Thou hast appointed his bounds that he cannot pass;
6 turn from him that he may rest,
till he shall accomplish, as an hireling, his day.

7 For there is hope of a tree,
if it be cut down, that it will sprout again,
and that the tender branch thereof will not cease.
8 Though the root thereof wax old in the earth,
and the stock thereof die in the ground;
9 yet through the scent of water it will bud,
and bring forth boughs like a plant.
10 But man dieth, and wasteth away!
yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?
11 As the waters fail from the sea,
and the flood decayeth and drieth up:
12 so man lieth down and riseth not:
till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake,
nor be raised out of their sleep.

13 O that Thou wouldest hide me in the grave,
that thou wouldest keep me secret until Thy wrath be past,
that Thou wouldest appoint me a set time, and remember me!
14 If a man die, shall he live again?

all the days of my appointed time will I wait,
till my change come.
15 Thou shalt call, and I will answer Thee;
Thou wilt have a desire to the work of Thine hands.
16 For now Thou numberest my steps;
dost Thou not watch over my sin?
17 My transgression is sealed up in a bag,
and Thou sewest up mine iniquity.

18 And surely the mountain falling cometh to nought,
and the rock is removed out of his place.
19 The waters wear the stones;
Thou washest away the things which grow out of the dust of the earth;
and Thou destroyest the hope of man.
20 Thou prevailest forever against him, and he passeth;
Thou changest his countenance, and sendest him away.
21 His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not;
and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.
22 But his flesh upon him shall have pain,
and his soul within him shall mourn.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Zophar in ch. xi. had specially arrayed against Job the wisdom and omniscience of God, in order to convict him partly of ignorance in Divine things, partly of his sinfulness and need of repentance. Job now meets this attack by strongly doubting the wisdom of his friends, or by representing it as being at least exceedingly ordinary and commonplace, being capable neither of worthily comprehending or describing the Divine wisdom and greatness, nor of demonstrating actual sin and guilt on his part. This demonstration of their incompetency, delivered in an ironical tone, accompanied by a description of the wisdom and strength of God far transcending that of Zophar in energy and inspired elevation of thought, forms the *first* part of his discourse (ch. xii.) This is followed by an emphatic asseveration of his innocence, clothed in the declaration of his purpose to appeal to God, the righteous Judge, and from Him, by means of a formal trial, to which he purposes summoning Him, to obtain testimony in favor of his innocence, which shall effectually dispose of the suspicions of the friends (ch. xiii. 1-22). As though such a trial had already been instituted, he then turns to God with a solemn assertion of his innocence, but failing to meet with a favorable declaration from God in answer to his appeal, he immediately sinks back into his former discouragement and despair, to which he gives characteristic expression in a long description of the shortness of life, the impotence and helplessness of man as opposed to the Divine omnipotence (ch. xiii. 23—xiv. 22). [Davidson characterizes this discourse as "this last and greatest effort of Job"]. Each of these three parts is subdivided into sections which are distinctly separated, Parts I. and II. into two sections each of about equal length; Part III. into five strophes of 5 to 6 verses each.

2. *First Division.—First Section:* Sarcasm on the wisdom of Zophar, and the two other speakers, as being quite ordinary and commonplace: ch. xii. 2-12.

First Strophe: Vers. 2–6. [Sarcasm on the friends (ver. 2) changing into angry invective (ver. 3), then into bitter complaint of his own lot (ver. 4), of the way of the world (ver. 5), and of the security of the wicked (ver. 6)].

Ver. 2. **Of a truth ye are the people.**—אַתֶּם עָם, with the logical accent on the first word, signifies not: "ye are people, the right sort of people," but: "*ye* are *the* people, the totality of all people, the race of men;" עָם, therefore as in Is. xl. 7; xlii. 5. The *Cod. Alex.* of the LXX. expresses correctly the sense; *μὴ ὑμεῖς ἐστέ ἄνθρωποι μόνοι.* As to אָמְנָם כִּי, comp. the simple אָמְנָם, ch. ix. 2.

Ver. 3. **I also have a heart as well as you**, *i. e.*, I lack understanding no more than you.—לֵבָב therefore as above in ch. viii. 10; ix. 4; comp. ch. xi. 12 ["he also has a heart like them, he is therefore not empty, נבוב," Del.], and as below in ver. 24.—**I do not stand behind you**: lit., "I do not sink down beneath you," or: "I do not fall away before you;" the מִן in מִכֶּם relates to the stand-point of the friends, *from which* Job might seem to be a נֹפֵל, one falling below them, meaner than themselves. [Ewald takes מִן in the comparative sense, which however would give an unsuitable rendering, "to fall more than another"].—**And to whom are such things not known?** Lit., "and with whom is not the like of these things?" *viz.*, the like of your knowledge of Divine things. אֵת, lit. "with," is used here in the sense of an inward indwelling, as also in ch. xiv. 5 *b*, and as elsewhere עִם is used: ch. ix. 35; x. 13, *etc.*

Ver. 4. **A mockery** (שְׂחֹק, lit., "a laughing," laughter, Inf. subst., like מְשֹׁל, ch. xvii. 6) **to my own friend must I be.**—[Lit., "a mockery to his neighbor, *etc.*]. Instead of לְרֵעֵהוּ

one might expect to find לְרֵעִי; an exchange of persons, however, takes place, that the expression may be made as general as possible: "one who is a mockery to his own friend must I be." Comp. similar examples of the exchange of persons in Ps. xci. 1 seq.; Is. ii. 8. ["*Must I become*, אֶהְיֶה best as exclamation, expressing Job's sense of indignity: (1) At such treatment from friends; (2) such treatment to such as he," (Dav.) see remainder of verse].—**I who called to Eloah and found a hearing**: lit., "one calling [still in 3d person] to Eloah, and He heard him," in apposition to the subject—I —in אֶהְיֶה: which is the case also with צַדִּיק תָּמִים, one who is just, godly (pure, blameless), comp. Prov. xi. 5 *a*, these words being placed with emphasis at the end of the whole exclamation. [Zöckler's rendering of this clause being: "a mockery (am I);—the just, the godly man!" Noyes and Wemyss render the second member: "I who call upon God that He would answer me" (or "to listen to me"). Noyes objects to the other rendering the use of the present participle. This form, however, is used to denote a continuous fact in Job's life, and a permanent quality grounded thereon, the Vav. consec. then indicating the Divine result consequent on Job's conduct and character.—E.].

Ver. 5. **For misfortune scorn—according to the opinion of the prosperous**: *i. e.*, the prosperous (lit. "the secure," who lives free from care, comp. Isa. xxxiii. 20) thinks, that contempt is due to the unfortunate. ["It is the ordinary way of the great multitude to overwhelm the unfortunate with contempt, and to give to the tottering still another push." Dillm.] בּוּז thus = *contemptus*, as in ver. 21, and ch. xxxi. 34; פִּיד = destruction, ruin, misfortune, as in ch. xxx. 24; xxxi. 29; Prov. xxiv. 22; and עַשְׁתּוֹת (*plur. fem. st. constr.* from עֶשֶׁת), or, after a form which is better authorized, עַשְׁתּוּת, signifies an opinion, fancy, thought (from עָשַׁת, to fashion, used of the mind's fashioning its thoughts). This is the interpretation adopted by most of the moderns, since the time of Aben Ezra. The rendering of the Targ., Vulg., [E. V.], Levi b. Gerson, and other Rabbis, preferred also by Luther, De Wette, Rosenm. [Noyes, Carey, Rod.], *etc.*, which takes לַפִּיד in the sense of a torch, yields no tolerable sense, at least no such sense as suits the second member ("a torch of contempt" [Luther: "a despised taper"] in the opinion of the prosperous is he who is ready to totter," or "to whom it is appointed that his feet slip," *etc.*) [Against this rendering, found in E. V., may be urged (1) The expression "a despised torch" is meaningless. As Con. suggests "a consumed or expiring torch would be pertinent, but a torch despised is like anything else that is despised." (2) נָכוֹן is superfluous and insipid. Why "*ready* to waver?" (3) This rendering presupposes a noun מוֹעַד, with the meaning *vacillatio*, wavering, lit. ready for waverings, for which however there is no authority, and which would require here rather the vowel pointing: מָעֳדֵי.—(4) It destroys the rhythm of the verse. See Con., Dillm., Dav. and Delitzsch. E.]. The rendering of Hitzig (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel* I., 112) is peculiar; לַפִּיד he takes to mean: "a soothing bandage, a cure" (from the root לפד, "to wind, or bind around," here the sing. corresponding to the plur. found in Judg. iv. 4, which is not a proper name [Lapidoth], but taken in connection with the preceding אֵשֶׁת signifies: "a mistress of healing bandages"), so that the sense would then be: "Healing is a scorn [is scorned] in the opinion of the prosperous" (?).—**Ready** (is it, the contempt) **for those whose foot wavers.**—נָכוֹן, Part. Niph. from כּוּן, hence ἕτοιμος, ready, as in Ex. xxxiv. 2. Comp. below xv. 23, where may also be found "the wavering of the foot" as a figurative expression of falling into misfortune; Ps. xxxviii. 17 (16) Ewald (*Bibl. Jahrb.* IX. p. 38) would instead of נָכוֹן read נָכְיוֹן, "a stroke," and Schultens and Dillmann would assign this same meaning of *plaga*, *percussio* to this same form נָכוֹן (from הִכָּה, נָכָה): "a stroke, is due to those whose foot wavers." As if a new parallelism of thought must of necessity be found between *a* and *b*!

Ver. 6. **Secure are the tents of the spoilers**, lit. to the spoilers; *i. e.*, to powerful tyrants, savage conquerors, and the like. On "tents" comp. ch. v. 24; xi. 14.—יִשְׁלָיוּ is the aramaizing third plur. form of a verb which has for its perf. שָׁלֵו (see ch. iii. 26), but which derives its imperf. forms from שָׁלָה. Moreover יִשְׁלָיוּ is not merely a pausal form, but stands here removed from the place of the tone: comp. the similar pathetic verbal forms in Ps. xxxvi. 9; lvii. 2; lxxiii. 2; also Ewald, § 194, *a*.—**And security** בַּטֻּחוֹת, *plur. et abstr.* from בָּטוּחַ (secure, free from care), **have they who defy God** ["שׁוֹרְדִים denotes the sin of these undeservedly prosperous ones against men, מַרְגִּיזֵי אֵל (lit. those who provoke God, who insolently assail Him) their wickedness against God." Schlott.] **they who carry Eloah in their hand**: lit., "he who carries," (לַאֲשֶׁר ..... הֵבִיא); from among those who rage against God and defy Him, one is selected as an example, such an one, *viz.*, as "bears God in his hand," *i. e.*, recognizes no other God than the one he carries in his hand or fist, to whom therefore his fighting weapon is to be his God; comp. Hab. i. 11, 16; also the "*dextra mihi Deus*" of Virg. Aen. 16, 773. [Delitzsch renders הֵבִיא a little more precisely perhaps: "he who causes Eloah to enter into his hand; from which translation it is clear that not the deification of the hand, but of that which is taken into the hand is meant. That which is taken into the hand is not, however, an idol (Abenezra), but the sword; therefore he who thinks after the manner of Lamech, as he takes the iron weapon of attack and defense into his hand, that he needs no other God." The deification of the weapon which a man wields with the power of his own right hand, and the deification of the power which

wields the weapon, as in Hab. l. c. and Mic. ii. 1, are, however, so nearly identical as descriptive of the character here referred to, that either resolves itself into the other. Conant, who adopts the rendering of E. V.: "he into whose hand God bringeth" (E. V. adds "abundantly") *i. e.* whom God prospers, objects that by the other rendering "the thought is expressed very coarsely, as to form, when it might be done in the Hebrew with great felicity." It is difficult to see, however, how the sentence: "he who takes God in his hand" could be expressed more idiomatically or forcibly than in the words of the passage before us. Wordsworth somewhat differently: "who grasps God in his hand. The wicked, in his impious presumption, imagines that he can take God prisoner and lead Him as a captive by his power." But this is less natural than the above.—E.]

Second Strophe: vers. 7-12. ["Return to the thought of ver. 3—the shallowness of the friends' wisdom on the Divine. Such knowledge and deeper every one possessed who had eyes and ears. For (1) every creature in earth and sea and air proclaimed it (7-10); and (2) every man of thought and age uttered it in the general ear (11, 12)." DAV.]

Ver. 7. **But ask now even the beasts—they can teach thee.**—["וְאוּלָם, *recovery* from the crushing thought of vers. 4-6, and strong antithesis to the assumption of the friends." DAV.] תֹּרֶךָּ, as also יַגֵּד in the second member, voluntative [or, jussive], hence not literally future—"they will teach it to thee"—as commonly rendered. Here the form of address is different from that adopted heretofore in this discourse, being now directed to *one* only of the friends, *viz.* to Zophar, to whose eulogy of the absolute wisdom of God (ch. xi. 7-9) reference is here made, with the accompanying purpose of presenting a still more copious and elaborate description of the same.

Ver. 8. **Or think thoughtfully on the earth**: lit. "think on the earth," *i. e.* direct thoughtfully thy observation to the earth (which comes under consideration here, as is evident from what follows, as the place where the lower order of animals is found, the רֶמֶשׂ, Gen. ix. 2; 1 Kings v. 13), and acquire the instruction which may be derived from her. The rendering of שִׂיחַ as a substantive, in the sense of "shrub" (comp. ch. xxx. 4; Gen. ii. 5), is on several grounds untenable; for שִׂיחַ, "shrub" is, according to those passages, masculine; the use of the preposition לְ instead of the genit., or instead of עַל or בְּ before הארץ, would be singular; and the mention of plants in the midst of the animals (beasts, birds, fishes), would be out of place (against Berleb. Bib., Böttcher, Umbreit, *etc.*).

Ver. 9. **Who would not know in all this,** *etc.*—So is בְּכָל־אֵלֶּה to be rendered, giving to בְּ the instrumental sense, not with Hahn—"who knows not concerning all this," which would yield too flat a sense, and lead us to overlook the retrospective reference which is to be looked for to the various kinds of animals already cited. Neither with Ewald [Hengst., Noyes] is it to be taken in the sense of "*among* all these," as if the passage contained a reference to a knowledge possessed by all the creatures of God as their Creator, or possibly to the groaning of the creature after the Godhead, as described in Rom. viii. 18 sq. This partitive rendering of בְּ (which Renan as well as Ewald adopts: "*qui ne saît parmi tous ces êtres,*" *etc.*) is at variance with the context, as well as the position of the words (לֹא יָדַע before בְּכָל־אֵלֶּה). **—That the hand of Jehovah hath made this.**—זֹאת refers essentially to the same object with כָּל־אֵלֶּה, only that it embraces a still wider circle of contemplation than the latter expression, which refers only to the classes of animals afore-mentioned. It denotes "the totality of that which surrounds us," the visible universe, the whole world (τὰ βλεπόμενα, Heb. xi. 3); comp. Is. lxvi. 2; Jer. xiv. 22; where כָּל־אֵלֶּה is used in this comprehensive signification; so also above in ch. xi. 8 seq., to which description of the all-embracing greatness of God there is here a manifest reference. Ewald, Dillmann [Conant, Davidson] translate: "that the hand of Jehovah hath *done* this." By זֹאת, "this," Ewald understands "the decreeing of suffering and pain" (of which also the groaning creation would testify); Dillmann refers it to the mighty and wise administration of God among His creatures; both of which explanations are manifestly more remote than the one given above. ["The meaning of the whole strophe is perverted if זֹאת is, with Ewald, referred to the 'destiny of severe suffering and pain.' . . . Since as a glance at what follows shows, Job further on praises God as the governor of the universe, it may be expected that the reference is here to God as the creator and preserver of the world. . . . Bildad had appealed to the sayings of the ancients, which have the long experience of the past in their favor, to support the justice of the Divine government; Job here appeals to the absoluteness of the Divine rule over creation." DELITZSCH.]—Apart from the Prologue (ch. i. 21), the name יְהוָה occurs only here in the mouth of Job, for the reason doubtless that the whole expression here used, which recurs again word for word in Is. xli. 20 (ch. lxvi. 2) was one that was everywhere much used not unfrequently also among the extra-Israelitish monotheists (and the same is true of the expression יִרְאַת אֲדֹנָי, ch. xxviii. 28).

Ver. 10. **In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all the bodies of men.**—["Evidently these words are more naturally referred to the act of preservation than to that of creation." SCHLOTTM.] Observe the distinction between נֶפֶשׁ, the lower principle of life, which fills all animals, and רוּחַ, the godlike personal spirit of man. Otherwise in Eccles. iii. 19, 21, where רוּחַ, in a wider sense, is ascribed even to the beasts.

Vers. 11, 12. To the knowledge of God which rests on the observation of the external cosmos (*notitia Dei naturalis externa s. acquisita*), is here added the human wisdom and insight which springs from experience, especially that of the aged, as a second source from which Job might draw (which may be regarded as the equivalent of that which is sometimes called *notitia Dei naturalis interna*).

Ver. 11. **Does not the ear prove sayings, even as** [וְ *adæquationis*, as in ch. v. 7] **the palate tastes food for itself** (לוֹ, *Dat. commodi*). Both comparisons illustrate the power of judicious discrimination possessed by the human spirit, by which it discerns the inner worth of things, especially as it exists in aged persons of large experience. So again later in Elihu's discourse, ch. xxxiv. 3. The opinion of Umbreit, Delitzsch, *etc.*, that Job in this verse utters an admonition not to receive without proof the sayings of the ancients, to wit, those of which Bildad had previously spoken, ch. viii. 10 ("*should* not the ear prove the sayings?"), lacks proper support. A reference to that remote passage in the discourse of Bildad should have been more clearly indicated than by the accidental circumstance that there as here the word מִלִּין, "sayings, utterances," is used. Moreover the "aged" who are here mentioned (יְשִׁישִׁים, as in ch. xv. 10; xxix. 8) are by no means identical with the fathers of former generations, whom Bildad had mentioned there.

Ver. 12. **Among the aged is wisdom, and a long life** (works, gives) **understanding** [or lit. "length of days is understanding"]. The verse is related to the preceding as logical consequent to its antecedent: As the ear determines the value of words, or the palate the taste of food, so aged men have been able to acquire for themselves in the course of a long life a true insight into the nature of things, and a truly rational knowledge of the same,—and I have been to school with such men, I have also ventured to draw from this source! This is the meaning of the passage as clearly appears from the context, and it makes it unnecessary to assume: *a.* with Starke, *etc.*, that Job reckons himself among the aged, and as such sets himself in the fullness of his self-consciousness against the three friends as being younger than himself (which is distinctly refuted by what we find in ch. v. 26; xxix. 8, 18; xv. 10); *b.* with Ewald, to conjecture the loss of a passage after ver. 12, which would furnish the transition from that verse to ver. 23; *c.* with Dillmann, that originally ver. 12 stood *before* vers. 9, 10, thus immediately following ver. 8; *d.* with Delitzsch, Hengstenberg, *etc.*, that ver. 23 is to be connected closely and immediately with ver. 12, so that thus the following order of thought would be expressed: assuredly wisdom is to be found among the aged, but in reality and in full measure it is to be found only with God, *etc.* [*i. e.* with Conant, that the verse is to be rendered interrogatively, on the ground that Job would not appeal to tradition in support of his positions; to which Davidson replies that "Job assails tradition only where he has found it false; and here, where he is exposing the *vulgarity* of the friends' much-boasted insight, it is quite in place to refer to the facility any one had for coming in contact with such information; and in xiii. 2, where Job recapitulates xii. 13-25, these two sources of information, *sight* and *hearsay* are directly alluded to."—Besides Delitzsch and Hengstenberg, Schlottmann and Merx connect the verse with the preceding. On the contrary Con., Dav., Dillm., Ren., Good, Wemyss, *etc.*, connect it with the following, and correctly so on account of the strict connection in thought, and especially the resumption of the thought in varying language in ver. 16.—In answer to the objection of abruptness in the transition if ver. 13 be detached from the preceding, Davidson says well that "it is quite in place; the whole chapter and speech is abrupt and passionate." —E.].

First Division: Second Section: An animated description of the exercise of God's wisdom and power, by way of actual proof that he is by no means wanting in the knowledge of God, which Zophar had denied to him: vers. 13-25. [It is possible perhaps to exaggerate this idea that Job in the passage following is consciously emulating his opponents. Something there is of this no doubt, but it must not be forgotten that the description here given of the Divine wisdom and omnipotence is an important part of Job's argument, as tending to show that these attributes so far from being employed by the ends which they had described, are exercised to produce hopeless confusion and ruin in human affairs.—E.].

First double strophe: Vers. 13–18 (consisting of two strophes of 3 verses each).

a. Vers. 13–15. [The theme in its most general statement].

Ver. 13. **With Him are wisdom and might, His are counsel and discernment.** —The suffixes in עִמּוֹ and לוֹ point back to Jehovah, vers. 9, 10, to whom the whole following description to ver. 25 in general relates. ["With Him, עִמּוֹ, *him*, doubly emphatic (a) in opposition to the just mentioned wisdom of men, ver. 12; (b) with *awe*-ful omission of Divine name, and significant allusion and intonation in the pronoun." Dav.]. The verse before us forms as it were the *theme* of this description, which presents Job's own personal confession of faith in respect to the nature and wisdom of God. It is therefore neither an expression of the doctrinal views of a "hoary antiquity," or of the aged sages of ver. 12 (Umbreit) [Ewald, Schlottm.], nor a statement of that which is alone to be esteemed as genuine Divine wisdom, in antithesis to the more imperfect "wisdom of the aged" (Delitzsch, Hengstenberg). There is to be sure a certain progression of thought from ver. 11 on: the adaptation to their uses of the organs of hearing and of taste, the wisdom of men of age and experience, and the wisdom of God, transcending all else, and united with the highest power, are related to each other as positive, comparative and superlative. But there is not the slightest intimation of the thought that the absolute wisdom of God casts into the shade those rudiments of itself which are to be found in the sphere of the creature, or would hold them

up as utterly worthless. Rather is what is said of the same in our verse in some measure the fruit, or a specimen of the wisdom of the aged which Job also claims to possess, as a pupil of such aged men. Comp. below Cocceius, in the Homiletical Remarks on ch. xii. 10-13. Of the four designations of the absolute Divine Intelligence here given, which accord with the language of Is. xi. 2, and the accumulation of which intensifies the expression to the utmost, חָכְמָה denotes that side of God's intelligence which "perceives things in the ground of their being, and in the reality of their existence" ["the general word and idea comprehensive of all others," Dav.]. גְּבוּרָה that "which is able to carry out the plans, purposes, and decisions of this universal wisdom against all hindrance and opposition" ["*virtus*, גֶּבֶר, *vir*." Dav.]; עֵצָה, that "which is never perplexed as to the best way of reaching its purpose;" תְּבוּנָה, that "which can penetrate to the bottom of what is true and false, sound and corrupt, and distinguish between them:" Delitzsch; [עֹז "actively force, passively strength, firmness:" Dav.].

Ver. 14. **Lo, He tears down, and it is not built up** (again). This is the first example of the irresistible exercise of this absolute might and wisdom of God. Job describes it as directed above all else to the work of tearing down and destroying, because in his recent mournful experiences he had been led to know it on this side of its activity; comp. ch. ix. 5 seq., where in like manner the mention of the destructive activities of the Divine omnipotence precedes that of its creative and constructive operation. Whether there is a reference to Zophar's expression (ch. xi. 10; so Dillmann) is doubtful. **He shuts up a man** (lit. "He shuts over a man"), **and it cannot be opened.** The expression סָגַר עַל, "to shut over any one," is to be explained from the fact that use was frequently made of pits, perhaps of cisterns, as prisons, or dungeons: comp. Gen. xxxvii. 24; Jer. xxxviii. 6; Lam. iii. 53. Where this species of incarceration is not intended, סָגַר is used either with the accus. or with בְּעַד (comp. ch. iii. 10; and 1 Sam. i. 6).

Ver. 15. **Lo, He restrains the waters, and they dry up** (Is. l. 38); **He letteth them forth** (again), **and they overturn the earth.** A remarkable parallel in thought to this description of the operation of the Divine omnipotence in the visible creation, now withdrawing and now giving life, but ever mighty in its agency, may be found in Ps. civ. 29, 30. A reference to Zophar's comparison of past calamity with vanished waters (ch. xi. 16) is scarcely to be recognized.

b. Vers. 16–18. [Resumption of the theme—specially of the Divine wisdom bringing confusion and humiliation on earth's mightiest].

Ver. 16. **With Him are strength and true knowledge** (תּוּשִׁיָּה, precisely as in ch. xi. 6). **His are the deceived and the deceiver** [the erring one, and the one who causes to err]: *i. e.*, His intelligence is so far superior to that of man that alike he who abuses his wisdom in leading others astray, and he who uses it for their good, are in His hand, and constrained to serve His purposes. He thus makes evil, moral and intellectual, subservient to the good: Gen. l. 20; Ps. xviii. 27. ["שָׁגַג and שגה here are to be understood not so much in the ethical as in the intellectual sense: if a man thinks himself wise because he is superior to another, and can lead him astray, in comparison with God's wisdom the deceiver is not greater (in understanding) than the deceived; He has them both in his hand, *etc*." Dillm.]

Ver. 17. **He leads counsellors away stripped**: or "who leads counsellors, *etc*."—for from this point on to the end of the description (ver. 24) Job speaking of God uses the present participle. The circumstantial accus. שׁוֹלָל, which here and in ver. 19 is used in connection with מוֹלִיךְ, (and that in the singular, like עָרוֹם, ch. xxiv. 7, 10), is rendered by the ancient versions "captive," or "chained" (LXX., Targ. on ver. 19: *αἰχμαλώτους*; Targ. on ver. 17: *catenis vinctos*), whereas etymologically the signification "made naked (*exutus*), violently stripped" is the only one that is authenticated. The word therefore is equivalent to the expression עָרוֹם וְיָחֵף "naked and barefoot," Is. xx. 4, not to "barefoot" alone, as Oehler, Hitzig, Dillmann, *etc*., suppose from comparison with the LXX. in Mic. i. 8. Naturally we are to understand the description here to be of counsellors led away stripped as captives taken in war: comp. Is. *l. c.* and 2 Chron. xxviii. 15, as also what pertains to יֹעֲצִים, "counsellors" in ch. iii. 14.—**And judges He makes fools.** יְהוֹלֵל, as in Isa. xliv. 25, to infatuate, to show to be fools. Such an infatuation of judges as would cause the military and political ruin of their country to proceed directly from them (as in the breaking out of great catastrophes over certain kingdoms, *e. g.* over Egypt, Is. xix. 17 seq.; over Israel and Judah, 2 Kings xix. 26, *etc*.), is not necessarily to be assumed here (comp. v. 20), although catastrophes of that character are here especially prominent in the thought of the speaker.

Ver. 18. **He looses the bond of kings**; *i. e.*, He looses the bond, or the fetters, with which kings bind their subjects, He breaks the tyrannical yoke of kings, and brings them rather into bondage and captivity, or as the second member expresses this thought more in the concrete: He "binds a girdle on their loins." It seems that אֵזוֹר lit. "girdle," in this second member should accord with מוֹסַר in the first. So much the more should the latter be pointed מוֹסֵר, and be construed as *stat. constr.* Comp. מוֹסֵר (= מַאְסֵר, from אָסַר, to bind). Of less authority, etymologically, is the interpretation required by the Masoretic punctuation regarded as *st. constr.* of מוּסָר, "discipline, *castigatio*," although it gives a sense quite nearly related to the preceding, it being presupposed that "discipline" is to be understood in the sense of "rule, authority" (so among the moderns, Rosenm., Arnh., Vaih., Hahn, Delitzsch [Ges., Carey], *etc*.). But "discipline" is a dif-

ferent conception from "authority," and "פִּתַּח can very well take for its object מוֹסְרִים, fetters, ch. xxxix. 5; Ps. cxvi. 16, but not *castigationem*." So Dillmann correctly, who also however rightly rejects the interpretation of Ewald, Hirzel, Heiligst., Welte, *etc.*, according to which מוסר מ׳ denotes "the fetters, with which kings are bound," so that the relation between *a* and *b* would be not that of a logical progression, but of direct antithesis, as in ver. 15. [Hengstenberg calls attention to the paronomasia of יֶאְסֹר, מוּסַר, and אֵזוֹר].

Second Double Strophe: Vers. 19–25 (divided into one strophe of three, and one of four verses): [The description continued: the agency of the Divine wisdom in confounding the great of earth].

a. Vers. 19–21. [Special classes of leaders brought to shame described].

Ver. 19. **He leads priests away spoiled** (see on ver. 17), **and those firmly established He overthrows.** [כֹּהֲנִים "priests," not "princes" (E. V.) "In many of the States of antiquity the priests were personages no less important, were indeed even more important and honored than the secular authorities." Dillm. "The juxtaposition of priests and kings here points to the ancient form of priestly rule, as we encounter the same in the person of Jethro, and in part also in Melchizedek." Schlott.].—All objects are called אֵיתָנִים, "firmly-enduring" [perpetual], which survive the changes of time. Hence the term is applied, *e. g.*, to water which does not become dry (*aquæ perennes*), or firmly founded rocks (Jer. xlix. 19; l. 44), or mighty, invincible nations (Jer. v. 15), or, as here, distinguished and influential persons (Vulg., *optimates*). [סלף, "*slip*, in Piel, *overthrow*, aptly antithetic [to איתן." Dav.].

Ver. 20. **He takes away the speech of the most eloquent**: lit. of "the trusted," of those who have been tried as a people's orators and counsellors; for they are the נֶאֱמָנִים (from אמן, to make firm, trustworthy, not from נְאֻם, to speak, as D. Kimchi thinks, who would explain the word *diserti*, as though it were punctuated נְאֻמִים). On *b* comp. Hos. iv. 11; and as regards טַעַם, "taste, judgment, tact," see 1 Sam. xxv. 33.

Ver. 21. **He pours contempt on nobles** (exactly the same expression as in Ps. cvii. 40), **and looses the girdle of the strong,** (אֲפִיקִים lit. "containing of great capacity" [Delitzsch: "to hold together, especially to concentrate strength on anything"] only here and ch. xli. 7; *i. e.*, He disables them for the contest (by causing the under-garments to hang down loosely, thus proving a hindrance for conflict; comp. Is. v. 27; also below ch. xxxviii. 3; xl. 7). The translation of Delitzsch is altogether too forced, and by consequence insipid: "He pours contempt on the rulers of the state, and makes loose the belt of the mighty."

b. Vers. 22–25. [The Divine energy as especially operative among nations].

Ver. 22. [This verse must naturally form the prelude to the deeper exercise of power and insight among nations, and its highest generalization, comp. 16 *b*." Dav.].—**He discovereth deep things out of the darkness, and brings forth to light the shadow of death;** *i. e.*, not: "He puts into execution His hidden purposes in the destiny of nations" (Schlottm.), ["for who would call the hidden ground of all appearances in God, צלמות!" Dilllm.], but: "He brings forth into the light all the dark plans and wickedness of men which are hidden in darkness;" comp. 1 Cor. iv. 5: φωτίσει τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους κ. τ. λ., and the proverb: "There is nothing spun so fine but all comes to the light;" see also ch. xxiv. 13 seq.; Is. xxix. 15; Rom. xiii. 12; 1 Thes. v. 5, *etc.* ["*Deep things out of the darkness*, עֲמֻקוֹת, must mean hidden tendencies and principles, *e. g.*, those running under national life, ver. 23, naturally more subtle and multiplex than those governing individual manifestation on however elevated a scale) and *darkness*, and *shadow of death*, figures (xi. 8) descriptive of the profoundest secresy. These secret tendencies in national life and thought—never suspected by men who are silently carried on by them—He detects and overmasters either to check or to fulfil." David. A truth "which brings joy to the good, but terror to all the children of darkness (xxiv. 13 seq.), and not without threatening significance even to the friends of Job." Dillmann].

Ver. 23. **He makes nations great, and—destroys them; He spreads nations abroad and—causes them to be carried away** (or: "carries them away captive," comp. הִנְחָה, synonymous with הִגְלָה, *abducere in servitutem;* also 2 Kings xviii. 11). [Rodwell: "then straitens them: leads them, *i. e.*, back into their former borders"]. Instead of מַשְׂגִּיא the LXX. (πλανῶν) as well as some of the Rabbis read מַשְׁגִּיא, "who infatuates, makes fools." But the first member of the verse corresponds strictly in sense to the second, on which account the Masoretic reading is to be retained, and to be interpreted of increase in height, even as the parallel שֹׁטֵחַ in *b* of increase in breadth, or territorial enlargement (not as though it meant a dispersion among other nations, as the Vulg. and Aben Ezra incorrectly interpret this שטח). [The לְ in both members, says Schlottmann, is not used Aramaice with the accus., but as sign of the *Dat. commodi.*]

Ver. 24. **He takes away the understanding** (לֵב as in ver. 3) **of the chief of the people of the land** (עַם־הָאָרֶץ, can certainly signify "the people of the earth, mankind," [Hirzel], after Isa. xlii. 5; for its use in the more limited sense of the people of a land, comp. below ch. xv. 19). ["We have intentionally

translated גוים "nations," עם people, for גוי is the mass held together by the ties of a common origin, language, and country; עָם, the people bound together by unity of government." Delitzsch].—**And makes them wander in a pathless waste**: (לֹא דָרֶךְ, synonymous with בְּלֹא־ד, or with אֵין־ד, comp. לֹא אִישׁ ch. xxxviii. 26; and Ewald, § 286, 8). The whole verse, the second member of which recurs *verbatim* in Ps. cvii. 40 presents an exact Hebrew equivalent for the Latin proverb: *quem Deus perdere vult, prius dementat*, a proverb on which the history of many a people and kingdom, from the earliest antiquity down to the present, furnishes an actual commentary that may well make the heart tremble. Concerning the catastrophes of historic nationalities in the most ancient times, which the poet here may not improbably have had before his mind, comp. Introd., § 6, *e*.

Ver. 25. **They grope in darkness without light and He makes them to wander like a drunken man.** Comp. Is. xix. 14, and especially above in ch. v. 13, 14, a similar description by Eliphaz, which Job here seems desirous of surpassing, in order to prove that he is in no wise inferior to Eliphaz in experimental knowledge of the righteous judgments of God, the infinitely Wise and Mighty One.

4. *Second Division: First Section:* Resolution to appeal to the judicial decision of God, before which the harsh, unloving disposition of the friends will assuredly not be able to maintain itself, but will be put to shame: ch. xiii. 1-12.

First Strophe: Vers. 1–6. [Impatience with the friends, and the purpose to appeal to God].

Ver. 1. **Behold, mine eye hath seen all** (that), **mine ear hath heard and perceived for itself.**—כֹּל here equivalent to כָּל־אֵלֶּה, "all that has been here set forth," all that has been stated (from ch. xii. 13 on) in respect to the evidences of the Divine power and wisdom in the life of nature and men. [לָהּ, *dativus commodi*, or perhaps only *dat. ethicus:* and has made it intelligible to itself (*sibi*); בִּין of the apprehension accompanying perception." Del.].—On ver. 2 comp. ch. xii. 3, the second member of which is here repeated word for word.

Ver. 3. **But I will speak to the Almighty.** אוּלָם, "but nevertheless," puts that which now follows in emphatic antithesis to the preceding: "notwithstanding that I know all this, I will still," *etc.* ["Three feelings lie at the back of this antithesis: (1) The folly of longer speaking to the friends. (2) The irrelevancy of all such knowledge as they paraded, and which Job had in abundance. (3) Antagonism to the prayer of Zophar that God would appear—Job desires nothing more nor better—*but I, to the Almighty will I speak.*" Dav.]. Observe also the significantly accented אֲנִי, *I* (ἐγὼ μὲν), which puts the speaker in definite antithesis to those addressed (אַתֶּם, ver. 4, ὑμεῖς δὲ), as one who will *not* follow their advice to make penitent confession of his guilt towards God; who will rather plead against God.—**I desire to plead with God.** הוֹכֵחַ, Inf. absol. as obj. of the verb; comp. ch. ix. 18; and for the signification of הוכח, "to plead, to vindicate one's cause against an accusation," comp. Amos v. 10; Isa. xxix. 21; also below ver. 15, ch. xix. 5. חפץ, to desire, to be inclined, here essentially as in ch. ix. 3. [יַחְפָּץ always for יַחְפֹּץ in pause]. That passage (ix. 3) certainly stands in some measure in contradiction to this, implying as it does the impossibility of contending with God; it is however a contest of another sort from that which is intended there that he proposes here, a contest not of one arrogantly taking the offensive, but of one driven by necessity to the defensive.

Ver. 4. **But ye are** (only) **forgers of lies.**—וְאוּלָם אַתֶּם puts another antithetic sentence alongside of the first which was introduced by אוּלָם (ver. 3), without however laying any special stress on אַתֶּם; hence: "and however, but again," *etc.;* not: "*ye* however" (Hirzel).—טֹפְלֵי שֶׁקֶר (from טפל, "to plaster, to smear, to paste together;" comp. טָפֵל, "plaster" Ez. xiii. 10 seq., and Talmudic טְפָלָה grease) are lit. "daubers of lies," *i. e.*, inventors of lies, *concinnatores s. inventores mendacii;* not: "imputers, fasteners of falsehood," *assutores mendacii*, as Stickel, Hirzel, Schlottmann, Delitzsch, *etc.*, explain both against philology and the context (neither ch. xiv. 17 nor Ps. cxix. 69 support this definition); nor again: "deceitful patchers," *sarcinatores falsi, i. e., inanes, idutilis*, as Hupfeld explains.—**Physicians of no value are ye all.**—רֹפְאֵי אֱלִל are not "patchers" [Con. "botchers"] of vanity," *i. e.*, such as patch together empty unfounded assertions (Vulg., Ew., Olsh., Dillm.), [Good, Con., Dav.], but in accordance with the universal usage of רפא: "worthless, useless physicians," *medici nihili*, miserable quacks, who are incapable of applying to Job's wounds the right medicine to soothe and heal. ["Job calls their false presuppositions regarding his guilt שֶׁקֶר, their vain attempts at a Theodicy and 'Theory of Providence' אֱלִיל." Dav.].

Ver. 5. **Oh that ye would be altogether silent—that would be reckoned to you for wisdom.**—Comp. Prov. xvii. 28; the Latin proverb: *Si tacuisses, philosophus mansisses;* also the honorable title, "*bos mutus*," the mute ox, given to Thomas Aquinas during his student life at Paris, by his fellow-students, as well as by his teacher, Albertus Magnus. The jussive, וּתְהִי, is used in a consecutive sense: "then would it be, prove, pass for;" comp. Ewald, § 347, *a*, Gesen., § 128, 2.

Ver. 6. **Hear now my reproof, and give heed to the charges of my lips.**—So correctly Hirzel, Dillm., Del., *etc.*, while several other moderns explain: "Hear my *defense* [Con., E. V., "reasoning"], and attend to the *arguments* of my lips" As if תּוֹכַחַת could signify anything else than ἔλεγχος, *correptio* (so cor-

rectly LXX., Vulg.—Comp. הוֹכִיחַ in ch. vi. 25; xl 2), and as if רִבוֹת (defectively for רִיבוֹת) could even in one instance sink the meaning of the stern word רִיב, "to strive, to quarrel!" Furthermore it is a long moral reproof and animadversion of the friends which immediately follows, vers. 7-12. His reply and vindication of himself to God first follows ver. 13 seq., or indeed properly not before ver. 17 seq.

Second Strophe: Vers. 7-12. [Scathing rebuke of their dishonesty and presumption in assuming to be God's advocates (vers. 7-9), and warning of the consequences to themselves when God shall rebuke them for their conduct].

Ver. 7. **Will ye for God** [לְאֵל emphatic] **speak that which is wrong, will ye for Him speak deceitfully?**—The preposition לְ signifies here "for, in favor of any one," as also in ver. 8, Judg. vi. 31. On עַוְלָה comp. ch. v. 16; vi. 30.

Ver. 8. **Will ye show partiality for Him** (lit. "lift up His countenance." *i. e* show preference for His person), **or will ye take the part of God's advocates?** (lit. "contend for God, comp. רִיב לַבַּעַל, Judg. vi. 31). These are the two possible ways in which they could "speak in favor of God:" either as *clients*, dependents, taking His part slavishly, for mercenary ends, or as *patrons* or *advocates*, presumptuously and naively taking Him under their protection. [There thus appears a subtle and very effective irony in these questions of Job's. His charge of partiality is also, as Davidson says, "a master-stroke of argumentation, effectually debarring the friends from any further defense of God in this direction, or almost at all."—E.].

Ver. 9. **Will it be well** [for you] **when He searches you out** (goes to the bottom of you, חקר as in Prov. xxviii 11; Ps. cxxxix. 23) **or can you deceive Him as a man is deceived?** *viz.* in regard to your real disposition and the sentiment of your heart, of which a more searching investigation must reveal to Him that it by no means corresponds to His holy nature and life.—הֵתֵל, Hiph. from תלל (in Imperf. תְּהָתֵלּוּ, with a non-syncopated ה, for תְּהָתֵלּוּ, Gesen. § 53 [§ 52] Rem. 7 [Green, § 142, 3]), is lit. "to cause to waver [to hold up anything swaying to and fro], to keep one in suspense, to make sport of any one," [E. V. "to mock"], hence to deceive; ensnare; comp. Gen. xxxi. 7; Judg. xvi. 10; Jer. ix. 4.) [Schlott., who renders: "will ye mock him?" explains by quoting from Jarchi: "*dicendo: in honorem tuam mendacia nos finximus*"].

Ver. 10. **Surely He will sorely chastise you** (ch. v. 17) **if ye are secretly partial:** *i. e.* if ye are actuated not by love of the truth and conscientious conviction, but by selfish interest in your relations with Him, as One who is mightier. That with which Job hereby reproaches them is (as Del. rightly observes) a ζῆλος θεοῦ ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν, Rom. x. 2 (comp John xvi. 2), "an advocacy contrary to one's better knowledge and conscience, in which the end is thought to sanctify the means."

Ver. 11. **Will not His majesty** (שְׂאֵת, as in ch. xxxi. 23, exaltation, dignity; not "a kindling of wrath," or "a lifting up for contention," as Böttch. renders it after the Vulg.) **confound you** (ch. iii. 5), **and the dread of Him** (פַּחְדּוֹ the dread, the terror which He inspires) **fall upon you**—then, namely, when He will reveal Himself as your Judge. Job here anticipates what according to ch. xlii. 7 seq. really happened afterwards. ["It is a peculiarity of the author of our book that he drops every now and then hints of how the catastrophe is to turn out, showing unmistakably both the unity of conception and the authorship of the book." DAV.]

Ver. 12. **Your maxims** (become) **proverbs of ashes**: to wit, then when God will judge you. זִכְרֹנִים, "memorable sayings, apothegms, memorabilia [Dav. "old saws"] (comp. Mal. iii. 16; Esth. vi. 1): so does he name here, not without irony, the admonitions and warnings which they had addressed to him, in part as the Chokmah of the ancients, or even as divinely inspired communications. ["The sarcasm in the word is cutting: comp. זְכָר־נָא of Eliph. ch. iv. 7; and viii. 8." DAV.] He characterizes these maxims as מִשְׁלֵי אֵפֶר, *i. e.* as empty and unsubstantial like ashes or dust, like ashes (the emblem of nothingness and worthlessness, Is. xliv. 20) scattered to every wind. The second member is strictly parallel: **Your bulwarks become bulwarks of clay.** ["While ver. 12 *a* says what their speeches, with the weighty *nota bene*, are, ver. 12 *b* says what their גַּבִּים become; for לְ always denotes a κίνησις=γένεσις, and is never the exponent of the predicate in a simple clause." DEL.] גַּב, lit. "back, ridge" (comp. ch. xv. 26) here equivalent to breastwork, bulwark; so does Job call here the *reasonings* behind which they sought refuge, the glittering, pathetically urged *arguments* which they had arrayed against him. Comp. עֲצֻמוֹת, Is. xli. 21, and ὀχυρώματα, 2 Cor. x. 4. [The rendering of E. V. "your bodies (are like) to bodies of clay," is evidently taken from the signification "back:" and the whole verse is a reminder of their mortality. But this is much less suited to the language used, less pertinent to the context, and less effective for Job's purpose than the rendering here given.—E.] For חֹמֶר, mud, potter's clay, as an emblem of what is frail, easily destroyed, incapable of resistance, comp. ch. xxxviii. 14; Is. xlv. 9 seq.

Second Division: Second Section: Declaration of his consciousness of innocence as against God in the form of a solemn confession, in which he boldly challenges Him: vers. 13-22.

First Strophe: vers 13-16. [Turning from the friends, he expresses more emphatically than before his purpose to appeal to God, cost what it may at the first, confident of ultimate acquittal. Dillmann says: "It seems that the poet intentionally cut this strophe short, in order by

this very brevity to emphasize more strongly the gravity of these thoughts."]

Ver. 13. **In silence leave me alone:** lit. "be silent from me" (מִמֶּנִּי), *i. e.*, desist from me, cease from your injurious assaults, and let me be in peace. [According to Schlott. the preposition here is the מִן of source or cause: be silent because of the weight of my words; acc. to the above, a *constr. prægnans* is assumed. Conant, *etc.*, translate: "Keep silence before me." Barnes thinks it "possible that Job may have perceived in them some disposition to interrupt him in a rude manner in reply to the severe remarks which he had made" Comp. on ch. vi. 29. More probably, however, the verse is, like ver. 5, an expression of his weariness with their vain platitudes, and unjust accusations, and a demand that they should stand by in silence while he should plead directly with God.—E.]—**Then will I speak,** or: in order that I may speak. [Conant: "*That I now may speak:* וַאֲדַבְּרָה־אָנִי." Strong double emphasis in the use of the cohortative future, and the pronoun; the latter emphasizing the first person, the former his strong determination to speak.—E.]—**And let come upon me what will.**—עָבַר as in Deut. xxiv. 5. מָה here for מָה שֶׁיַּעֲבֹר, a condensed form of expression similar to וִיהִי מָה. 2 Sam. xviii. 22; comp. Ewald, § 104, *d*.

Ver. 14. **Wherefore should I take my flesh into my teeth:** *i. e.* be solicitous to save and to preserve my body at any price, like a beast of prey, which drags off its booty with its teeth, and so secures it against other preying animals. This proverbial saying, which does not occur elsewhere, is in itself clear (comp. Jer. xxxviii. 2). The second member also signifies essentially the same thing: **and** (wherefore should I) **put my soul in my hand:** *i. e.* risk my life, seek to save it by means of a desperate exertion of strength (comp. the same expression in Judg. xii. 3; 1 Sam. xix. 5; xxviii. 21). [This, says Dillmann, is indeed "scarcely the original meaning of the phrase; nor is it to be understood, as commonly explained that what one has in the hand easily falls out and is lost. The primary meaning is rather: to commit or entrust the life to the hand in order to bear it through, *i. e.* to make a desperate effort to save it (see Ewald on the passage): such an attempt is indeed dangerous, because if the hand fails, the life is lost, and so the common explanation attaches itself naturally to the phrase, to expose the life to apparent danger. Here, however, the original meaning is altogether suitable, and indeed necessary, because only so do the first and second members agree: why should I make an extreme effort to save my life?"] Such a desperate effort Job would make, in case he should declare himself guilty of the reproaches brought against him, while at the same time he bore no consciousness of guilt within himself. This, however, would not be of the least avail, for according to ver. 15 *a* he has nothing more to hope for, he sees before him nothing but certain death from the hand of God. Hence, therefore, his question: "Wherefore should I seek to save my life at any price—I who have nothing more to hope for?" Compared with this interpretation, which is the only one suited to the context, and which is adopted by Umbreit, Ewald, Vaih., Dillm., *etc.*, the many interpretations which vary from it are to be rejected, especially those according to which the second member is not to be regarded as a continuation of the question, but as an assertion—according to Hirzel in the positive form: "and even my life do I risk"—according to Hahn and Delitzsch in the negative: "nay, I even put my life at stake:" in like manner, that of Böttcher: "wherefore should I seek to preserve my life at any price, seeing that I willingly expose it, *etc.*"

[Wordsworth agrees in this interpretation of the meaning of each member of the verse, but differs from Zöckler, *etc.*, in the application: "The question (he says) is put hypothetically. You may ask me why I am thus bold to desire to expose myself to a trial before God? The reason is because I am sure that I have a good cause; I know that in the end He will do me right. See what follows."—The Vulg. renders: "*Quare lacero carnes meas dentibus meis, et animam meam porto in manibus meis?*" Hengstenberg follows this rendering, explaining the first clause of the wrong, the violence which he would do to his moral personality, if by silence he should plead guilty to the accusations of the friends. Schultens, who is followed in substance by Rosenmüller, Good, Wemyss, Bernard, Barnes, Renan, Davidson, Carey, Rodwell, Elzas, regards both members as proverbially expressing the idea of risking life, and the clause עַל־מָה not in its usual interrogative sense, but as equivalent to: "in spite of every thing." (Schult., *super quid*, on any account.) מָה is thus a resumption of the מָה in 13 *b*. This rendering gives a consistent and forcible sense throughout: Be silent now, and let me alone, and I for my part will assuredly speak, be the consequence what it may: Cost what it may, I will risk it all, I will risk my person and my life: lo, He will slay me, *etc.*, yet in his very presence, *etc*, (comp. on ch. ix. 21, 22). The objection to this is of course the unusual rendering of עַל־מָה. On the other hand the objection to the interpretation adopted in our comm. is the unusual sense in which we are constrained to take the proverbial expressions of the verse, particularly the latter—"to take the life in the hand"—which according to this interpretation must mean to seek to save the life, whereas in every other instance it means to risk it. It is thus at best a choice between difficulties, or unusual expressions. And it may fairly be queried whether the difficulty in regard to עַל־מָה is not largely obviated by the close connection in which it stands with the מָה just preceding.—E.].

Ver. 15. **Lo, He will slay me:** *viz.* through my disease, which will certainly bring about my speedy dissolution (comp. ch. vi. 13; vii. 6; ix. 25; x. 20). **I have no** (more) **hope;** *i. e.*, I do not direct my thoughts to the future, I am not in a state of waiting, expectation (יָחֵל without

an obj., *præstolari*, exactly as in ch. vi. 11, and xiv. 14), and this indeed is so naturally, because for me there is nothing more to wait for, seeing that my condition is hopeless, and my fate long since decided. So, according to the K'thibh is the phrase לא אֲיַחֵל to be explained, while the K'ri, לוֹ א must signify in accordance with the suffix: "until then, *viz.*, until I am slain, I wait" (so substantially Luther), or again: "I wait for Him, that He may slay me" (Delitzsch) [*i. e.*, "I wait what He may do, even to smite with death"]. The context by no means yields the rendering of the Vulg., which also rests on the K'ri; *etiam si occiderit me, in ipso* (*Deo*) *sperabo* [so also E. V., "though he slay me, yet will I trust in Him"]: an utterance which has acquired a certain celebrity as a favorite sentiment alike of pious Jews and Christians (comp. Delitzsch on the passage), as the funeral text of the Electoress Louise Henriette of Brandenburg, and as the poetic theme of a multitude of popular religious hymns. It scarcely expresses however the meaning here intended by Job, which is far removed from any expression of a hope reaching beyond death.—**Only my ways** (*viz.*, the innocence of my ways) **will I prove in His presence.** אַךְ, referring back to the whole preceding sentence, hence the same as "nevertheless, however." He has already despaired of life, but of one thing he does not despair, freely and openly to prove before God the blamelessness of his life: "physically therefore he can succumb, that he concedes, but morally he cannot" (Del.).

Ver. 16. **Even this will be my salvation that the unholy comes not before Him**: *i. e.*, does not dare to present himself so confidently before Him. In the fact that He is filled with παῤῥησία towards God he sees accordingly a pledge of salvation, *i. e.*, of *victory* in the trial in which he is involved. For this sense of יְשׁוּעָה comp. 1 Sam. xiv. 45; 2 Chron. xx. 17; Hab. iii. 8 (not however in ch. xxx. 15, where it signifies rather prosperity, and that of the earthly sort). ["He wavers between two contradictions: on the one side he believes according to an opinion widely prevalent in the Semitic East, that no one can see God without dying; on the other side he reassures himself with the thought that God cannot reveal Himself to the wicked." Renan]. הוּא is referred by Böttcher, Schlott., [Con., Dav., and so E. V.], *etc.*, to God: "He also ministers to my help, to my deliverance, *for*, *etc.* But this does not agree with the contents of the preceding verse. For the neuter rendering of הוּא, which we find already in the LXX., (*καὶ τοῦτό μοι ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν*) comp. ch. xv. 9; xxxi. 28; xli. 3. [In favor of the personal sense for הוּא, referring it to God, Schlottmann argues that it would scarcely be said of a circumstance in Hebrew that it would be anybody's salvation: and Davidson objects to the neuter rendering that it originates in a cold conception of Job's mental agitation, and gives to לִישׁוּעָה a sense feeble almost to imbecility. On the other hand Dillmann argues against the masculine sense that in that case the connection between the first and second members of this verse would be imperfect, and that the contrast between what would thus be said of God in this verse and that which has been said in ver. 15 would be too violent].

Second Strophe: Vers. 17-22. ["Determination to cite God finally reached, with conditions of pleading before Him."—Dav.].

Ver. 17. **Hear, O hear my declaration.**—שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמוֹעַ, a strongly emphasized appeal that they should hear him, essentially the same in signification as Is. vi. 9, only that here is not intended as there a *continued* but an *attentive* hearing *for the time being;* comp. ch. xxi. 2; xxxvii. 2.—מִלָּה, here "declaration," signifies in Arabic confession, religion. Its synonym אַחֲוָה in the second member, [**and let my utterance sound in your ears**], formed from the Hiph. of the verb חוה (ch. xv. 17; Ps. xix. 3) signifies here (the only place where it occurs in the O. T.) not "brotherly conduct" as in post-biblical Hebrew, but "utterance." With וְאַחֲוָתִי it is better to supply תְּהִי or תָּבוֹא, "let it enter, let it sound in your ears," than to repeat שִׁמְעוּ from *a*.

Ver. 18. **Behold now I have made ready the cause.** עָרַךְ מִשְׁפָּט, *causam instruere*, as in ch. xxiii. 4; comp. the simple עָרַךְ, ch. xxxiii. 5. On *b* comp. ch. xi. 2.

Ver. 19. **Who is he that will contend with me?** *i. e.*, attempt with success to prove that I am in the wrong. As to the thought compare the parallel passages, Isa. l. 9; Rom. viii. 34; and as to the lively interrogative מִי הוּא, ch. iv. 7.—**Then indeed** (if any one succeeds in that, in convicting me of wrong) **I would be silent and die**: then, as one defeated within and without, I would without offering further resistance, let death come upon me as merited punishment. The explicitness and calmness with which he makes this declaration shows how impossible it seems to him that he should be proved guilty, how unalterably firm he stands in the consciousness of his innocence. [E. V., "for now, if I hold my tongue, I shall give up the ghost," is less simple, and less suited to the connection].

Ver. 20. **Only two things do not Thou unto me**: these are the same two things which he has already deprecated in ch. ix. 34 in order that he may successfully achieve his vindication, and so, as it is here expressed in *b*, not be obliged to hide before God. In ver. 21 we are told wherein they consist, *viz.*, *a*, in heavy unremitting calamities and chastisements ("Thy hand remove Thou from me"), כַּף here of the hand which punishes, as previously שֵׁבֶט in ch. ix. 34); and *b*, in terror, confusion, and trepidation produced by His majesty; comp. above, ver. 11.

Ver. 22. **Then**—if these two alleviations are granted to me—**call Thou and I will answer**: *i. e.*, summon me then to a criminal trial, or which would be eventually still more advantageous to me: "allow *me* the first word, let me be the questioner." Obviously it is in this sense that we are to take *b*, where הֵשִׁיב, "to reply"

(supply דָבָר) is connected transitively with accus. of the person, as elsewhere עָנָה; comp. ch. xx. 2; xxxii. 14; xl. 4.

6. *Third Division.* The vindication of himself to God, with a complaint over the vanity and helplessness of human existence: ch. xiii. 23—xiv. 22. ["That Job, lifted up by the proud consciousness of innocence, might really fancy for the moment that God would answer his challenge, is not in itself improbable in view of the present temper of his soul, and the entire plan of the poem, according to which such an intercourse of God with men as may be apprehended by the senses lies within the bounds of possibility (ch. xxxviii. seq.), and should not be described (with Schlottm.) as a fanatical thought; although indeed he could not long continue in this fancy; not only the non-appearance of God, but also every consideration of a more particular sort must convince him of the idleness of his wish." Dillmann. Hence the sudden change of his apology to a lamentation].

First Strophe: Vers. 23–28. Having repeatedly announced his purpose (ver. 13 seq., 17 seq.), Job now at length passes directly to the demonstration of his innocence, but at once falls from a tone of confident self-justification into one of sorrowful lamentation, and faint-hearted despair, out of which he does not again emerge during this discourse.

Ver. 23. **How many are** (then) **my iniquities and sins; my wickedness and my sin make known to me!**—Inasmuch as חַטָּאת denotes sin or moral aberration in general (occasionally also indeed sins of weakness), עָוֹן transgression or evil-doing of a graver sort, פֶּשַׁע however flagrant wickedness, open apostasy from God (comp. Hoffmann, *Schriftbew.* I., 483 seq.), the enumeration which is here given is on the whole neither climactic nor anti-climactic, but alike in *a* and *b* the more special and stronger expression precedes, while the more general term follows. Observe still further that the characteristic expression used to denote the smallest and slightest offenses, שְׁגִיאוֹת (Ps. xix. 13) is not introduced here at all. Of such failures of the most insignificant sort Job would indeed be perfectly well aware that he was guilty; comp. above ch. ix. 2, 14 seq.

Ver. 24. **Wherefore hidest Thou Thy face** (a sign of the Divine displeasure, comp. Is. liv. 8) **and regardest me as Thine enemy?**—The question is an expression of impatient wonder at the non-appearance of God.

Ver. 25. **A driven leaf wilt Thou terrify?** הֶעָלֶה with He interrog. like הֶחָכָם, ch. xv. 2. Comp. Gesenius § 100 [§ 98], 4 [E. V. "wilt thou *break* a leaf," *etc.* And so Bernard: but against usage]. **And pursue the dry chaff?** The meaning of this troubled plaintive double question is: How canst Thou, who art Almighty and All-sufficient, find Thy pleasure in persecuting and afflicting a weak and miserable creature like me? It is not with reference to the universal frailty of mankind, of which he partook (Hahn), but with special reference to the fearful visitation which had come on him, and the destruction which had begun in his body, that he compares himself to a "driven leaf," *i. e.* one that is tossed to and fro by the wind (comp. Lev. xxvi. 36), and to the dry chaff, which is in like manner blown about (comp. Ps. i. 4. *etc.*).

Ver. 26. **For Thou decreest for me bitter things** (or also with consecutive rendering of כִּי: "that Thou decreest," *etc.*). מְרֹרוֹת here is equivalent of course to "bitter painful punishments;" and כתב, lit. to "write," refers to a written decree announcing a judicial sentence: comp. ch. xxxi. 35; Ps. cxlix. 9; Is. x. 1.—**And makest me to inherit the iniquities of my youth**: the sins of my earlier years, long since forgiven and forgotten, by comparison with which as being the half-conscious misbehaviour of childhood, or the manifestations of youthful thoughtlessness (Ps. xxv. 7), so severe and fearful a penalty would seem to be needless cruelty. ["He can regard his affliction only as the inheritance of the sins of his youth, since he has no sins of his mature years that would incur wrath to reproach himself with." Del.—E. Ver. "makest me to *possess*," *etc.*, not sufficiently expressive. "His old age inherited the accumulated usury and consequence of youthful sins." Dav.] "To cause one to inherit anything" is the same as causing him to experience the consequences of anything (here the *bad* consequences, the punishments); comp. Prov. xiv. 18; Ps. lxix. 37 (36); Mark x. 17; 1 Cor. vi. 10, *etc.*

Ver. 27. **And puttest my feet in the block**: *i. e.* treatest me as a prisoner. וְתָשֵׂם, poet. for וְתָשֶׂם, Ewald, § 443, *b* [jussive in form though not in signification; used simply "from the preference of poetry for a short pregnant form." Del.], comp ch. xv. 33; xxiii. 9, 11.—סַד here and ch. xxxiii. 11 is a wooden block with a contrivance for firmly fastening the feet of a prisoner, the same with the מַהְפֶּכֶת of Jer. xx. 3, and the ξύλον of Acts xvi. 24, or ποδοκάκη, or the Roman instruments of torture called *cippus*, *codex* or *nervus*. In times still recent wooden blocks of this kind were in use among the Arabians, as Burckhardt had occasion to observe (Travels, p. 420). **And watchest all my paths**: *i. e.* does not allow me the slightest freedom of motion: comp. ch. vii. 12; x. 14.—**Around the roots of my feet Thou dost set bounds**: *i. e* around the place where I stand, where the soles of my feet are placed (the soles firmly fixed in one point being compared to the roots of a tree), Thou dost make marks, bounds, lines of demarcation, which Thou dost not permit me to cross. This is the simplest and philologically the most suitable definition of the Hithpael הִתְחַקָּה (from חק, חקה); found only here, in which definitions Gesenius, Ewald (1st Ed.), Schlottm., Hahn, Del, Dillm., [Con., Elz.—and see below the rendering of Hirzel, Noyes, *etc.*], *etc.*, essentially agree. Not essentially different as to the sense, although philologically not so well authenticated are the explanations of Rosenm., Umbreit [Hengst., Merx], *etc.*: "Thou drawest a circle around my feet;" of Ewald (2d Ed.): "Thou makest sure of my

feet" (comp. Peshito and Vulgate: *vestigia pedum meorum considerasti*); of Hirzel [Fürst]: "Thou dost make Thyself a trench around the roots of my feet" [others, *e. g.* Noyes, Renan, Davidson, Rödiger, take חקה in this sense of cutting or digging a trench, but regard the Hithpael as indirectly and not directly reflexive, *sibi*, not *se susculpere*—"dost dig a trench for thyself"]; of Raschi, Mercier, *etc.*: "Thou fastenest Thyself to the soles of my feet." [E. V., Good, Wem., Bernard, *etc.*: "Thou brandest (settest a print upon, E. V.) the soles of my feet;" evidently supposing the expression to refer to some process of branding criminals in the feet: for which, however, there is no good authority.]—The three parallel figures contained in the verse all find their actual explanation in the fearful disease, with which Job was visited by God, in consequence of which he was doomed to one place, being unable to move on account of the unshapely swelling of his limbs. ["Mercier has already called attention to the gradation which marks the proofs given in these verses of the Divine anger. (1) God hides His face. (2) He shows Himself an enemy. (3) He issues severe decrees against him. (4) He punishes sins long since passed. (5) He throws him into cruel and narrow imprisonment." Hengst.]

Ver. 28. **Although he** (the persecuted one) **as rottenness wastes away, as a garment which the moth has eaten** (comp. ch. iv. 19). This forcible description of the weakness and perishableness of his condition is given to emphasize the thought, how unaccountably severe is God's treatment of him (comp. above ver. 25). It is introduced by וְהוּא (instead of וַאֲנִי) objectivizing the subject, and "giving to the discourse a more general application, valid also for other men," and at the same time providing a transition to the following lament, referring to human misery in general. ["Thou hast set this enclosure around one who does not grow like a tree, but moulders away moth-eaten like a garment. Job looks at himself *ab extra;* he will hardly own himself; he hardly recognizes himself, so changed is he by affliction and disease, and he speaks of himself in the *third* person. How natural and touching is this!" Wordsworth.]

Third Division: Second and Third Strophes: The lament over man's mortality, frailty and vanity continued: ch. xiv. 1-12.

Second Strophe: vers. 1–6. [Man's physical frailty and moral impurity by nature made the ground of a complaint against the severity of God's treatment, and of an appeal for forbearance.]

Vers. 1, 2. **Man, born of woman, of few days, and full of trouble, cometh up as a flower [and withereth, and fleeth as a shadow, and abideth not].**—This is the only right construction of the passage. The first verse contains only the subject, together with three appositional clauses more particularly descriptive of the same. Of these the first, יְלוּד אִשָּׁה (a phrase which is elsewhere exactly synonymous with "man," *e. g.* Sir. x. 18: *γέννημα γυναικός*, and Matt. xi. 11: *γέννητος γυν.*), belongs immediately to the notion contained in the subject, man, whom it characterizes according to his innate quality of weakness (as also in ch. xv. 14; xxv. 4), while the two following clauses illustrate the shortness of his life, (קְצַר, constr. st. of קָצֵר, comp. ch. x. 15), and the trouble which fills it (רֹגֶז, as in ch. iii. 17, 26). It is disputed whether the second verb in ver. 2, וַיִּמָּל means *to wither*, or *to be cut off.* Etymologically both these definitions are possible, since יִמָּל may be taken either as Imperf. Niph. of מוּל=מלל, *succidi*, or as Imperf. of a secondary Kal. נָמַל (an alternate form מלל), synonymous with אָמַל, to wither, to become dry, *marcescere.* The meaning *to be cut off*, however, is less suitable to the flower than *to fade* [the latter, and not the former, being, as Dillmann points out, the *natural* destiny alike of the flower and of man]; comp. Is. xl. 7; Ps. xxxvii. 2; xc. 6; ciii. 15 seq.; Matt. vi. 30; 1 Pet. i. 24; moreover, in the two parallel passages of our book, ch. xviii. 16; and xxiv. 24, it is by no means necessary to render יִמָּל in the sense of *succidi*, *præcidi* (against Hirzel, Gesenius, Delitzsch [Conant, Dav., E. V.], *etc.*). On *b* comp. ch. viii. 9; Ps. xc. 5, 9, 10. [Conant regards the article before צֵל as having a *definite* signification, "that which marks the passing and declining day." This, however, would scarcely be in harmony with the verb ברח, which describes rather the fleeting shadow of the cloud, to which the art. would be equally suitable. Merx transposes ver. 28, of chap. vii., and inserts it here between vers. 1 and 2, thus depriving it of the force and beauty which belong to it as the closing verse of that strophe, and as a transition to this, and at the same time weakening the beauty and pathos of this passage by the accumulation of figures. —E.]

Ver. 3. **And upon this one dost Thou keep Thine eye open?** *viz.* in order to watch him, and to punish him for his sins, comp. Ps. xxxiv. 17 [16]. אַף, emphatically connecting something new with what has already been given, like our "over and above." עַל־זֶה, "upon this one," *i. e.* upon such an one as he is here described, upon so wretched a creature (Psalm ciii. 14). [The pronoun here descriptive, "such an one," *talis*, rather than demonstrative. By position the phrase is emphatic. E. V., Conant, *etc.*, render the verb simply "to open,"=so much as open the eyes, so much as look upon him. The rendering given in our commy. "to keep the eye open upon" presupposes a double emphasis, the first and principal one on the pronoun, the second on the verb. —E.]—**And me** ([אֹתִי, emphatic, *me*] this particularly wretched example of the human race), **dost thou bring into judgment before Thee?**—*i. e.*, to judgment at *Thy* tribunal, where it is impossible to maintain one's cause.

Ver. 4. **O that a pure one might come forth out of an impure:** *i. e.*, would it were only possible that *one* might remain free from the

universal sinfulness of the human race, and from the misery accompanying the same, which is now absolutely universal and without exception, so that it has the appearance of unpitying severity when God visits those belonging to this race with punishment (comp. vers. 5, 6). מִי־יִתֵּן, the customary optative formula (as in ver. 13; ch. vi. 8), here connected with an accusative of the object, specifying the contents of the wish (so also in ch. xxxi. 31, 35; Ps. xiv. 7; Deut. xxviii. 67). Hence not: "who *makes* [E. V.: can bring] a pure one out of an impure?" (Rosenm., Arnheim, Welte, [Renan]); nor: "where can a pure one be found among the impure?" as if מִן here could have the partitive sense before the singular טָמֵא. ["The Opt. rendering not only denies the possibility (of a morally clean coming out of a morally unclean), but gives utterance to the desire that it was otherwise." Dav.]. **Not one**: to wit, "comes forth." [Not therefore "can bring forth," as might be inferred from the literal rendering of מִי־יִתֵּן]. Not *one* pure will ever come forth in the line of development which has once been contaminated by sin; comp. Ps. li. 7 [5]; also the expression אֵין גַּם אֶחָד Ps. xiv. 3, which reminds us very closely of this לֹא אֶחָד. Ewald, with whom Dillmann agrees, punctuates לֻא instead of לֹא, and conforms the second member to the first: "Oh that there were one!" for the reason that a wish does not properly contemplate an answer. But a wish which is in itself incapable of realization is equivalent to a question, the answer to which is a strong negation. Moreover the passage is incomparably stronger and more emphatic according to the common rendering, than according to that of Ewald ["Moreover, why should he desire *one* such specimen? Plainly, the desire is nothing to the purpose, except as implying that not one such is to be found; and precisely this is asserted in the proper and usual construction of the words." Con.]. On the relation of this assertion by Job of the universality of human corruption to the earlier affirmation of Eliphaz in ch. iv. 17 seq., see the Doc. and Eth. Remarks.

Vers. 5, 6. (the former the antecedent, the latter the consequent).—**If his days are determined** (חֲרוּצִים, lit. cut off [*decisi*], sharply bounded, defined ἀποτόμως: comp. Isa. x. 22; 1 Kings xx. 40), **the number of his months with Thee** (*viz.* "is established, firmly fixed;" אִתָּךְ here equivalent to עִמָּךְ, comp. ch. x. 13), **and Thou hast made** [or set] **his limit** (read חֻקּוֹ with the K'thibh, not the plural with the K'ri, which is here less suitable, there being but one limit, one terminus to this earthly life)—**which he cannot pass** (lit. "and he passes it not") [observe that the particle אִם in the first member of the verse extends its influence over all three members]: **then look away from him,** (שְׁעֵה מֵעָלָיו the opposite of ver. 3 *a;* comp. ch. vii. 19) **that he may rest** (חדל here as in 1 Sam. ii. 5: "to rest, to keep holiday," to be released from the רֹגֶז of ver. 1) **that he may enjoy as a hireling his day.**—The last member literally reads: "until that (to the degree that—עַד as in ch. viii. 21; 1 Sam. ii. 5; Isa. xlvii. 7) he, like a day-laborer, find pleasure in his day," or, "be satisfied with his day" This is the meaning of רָצָה with the accus.—(comp. Jer. xiv. 10; Ps. cii. 15, and often); not "to satisfy," in the sense of "to discharge, to make good," [E. V. to accomplish] as Delitzsch explains it, when he translates: "until he discharges [accomplishes] as a hireling his day." In favor of this latter rendering indeed, Lev. xxvi. 34, 43, and 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21 may be cited; but the sense thence resulting is in each case harsh and artificial. For just why it should be said of a hireling, that he (in death) "makes complete" his days (comp. ἀνταναπληροῦν, Col. i. 24) is not altogether apparent: the comparison of the שָׂכִיר (comp. ch. vii. 1) seems superfluous, inconsistent indeed, if we have to do simply with the thought: "until the completion of the days of his life." [It is difficult to see why the definition adopted by the E. V. and Del. is not perfectly suitable to the connection. The objection to it is that it is not supported by usage. רצה means everywhere "to regard favorably, to take pleasure in." We are not justified in taking it in any other sense here. But the expression "to enjoy as a hireling his day" is variously understood. Some take יוֹמוֹ here in some specific sense; *e. g.*, the day of his discharge, his last day as a hireling (Bernard); his day of rest (Rodwell); and something similar is suggested by Jerome's *optata dies.* But this thought would have been more distinctly expressed.—Others (Hengst., Wordsworth, Noyes, Barnes), explain it as a wish that man may enjoy his life at least as much, with the same freedom from care, as the hireling. But to this there are several objections. (1) רצה would scarcely be used to express this idea, least of all, as here, without any qualification. (2) That Job regarded the day or service of a hireling as a term of hardship, from which deliverance was to be sought rather than as affording any measure of satisfaction to be desired, is evident from the parallel passage in ch. vii. 1, 2. Comp. ch. iii. 19. (3) He has already expressed the burden of his longing in וְיֶחְדָּל. This clause is rather to be regarded as an amplification of that thought: the rest, the enjoyment which the end of the day's labor brings.—It is unnatural to suppose that having reached in thought the goal of rest, he would go back to the joyless, even though painless toil preceding it. We are thus led to the explanation that the enjoyment here spoken of is that which succeeds the labors of the day. The hireling's real enjoyment of his day comes when the "shadow" of evening (ch. vii. 2) brings with it the rest which he covets, and the wages he has earned. In like manner Job desires for man agitated by unrest (רֹגֶז ver. 1) a respite, however brief, the satisfaction which the *end* of toil and sorrow would bring. It is not death however that he here prays may come, for that, as the following verses show, is a hopeless condition. And yet the thought of the end of toil suggests at once the thought of death and that hopeless beyond.—E.].

Third Strophe: Vers. 7-12. The hopelessness of man when his earthly life is ended.

Ver. 7. **For there is yet hope for the tree.** כִּי, "for" introduces the reason for the request preferred in ver. 6 in behalf of miserable and afflicted man: "look away from him," *etc.* ["The predication of *hope* made very strongly both by יֵשׁ and the accent, the main division of the verse is at hope." Dav.].—**If it be cut down, it shoots up again** (*viz.*, the stump left in the ground, comp. Isa. vi. 13), **and its sprout** יוֹנַקְתּ, the tender young shoot from the root [suckling], LXX. ῥάδαμνος; comp. ch. viii. 16) **faileth not.** Carey, Delitzsch, and others, correctly understand the tree of whose vitality and power of perpetual rejuvenescence Job seems more particularly to think here to be the date-palm, which on account of this very quality is called by the Greeks φοίνιξ. It is not so probable that the oak or terebinth [E. V. "teil"] mentioned in the parallel passage in Isa. vi. 13, is intended here

Vers. 8, 9, present not properly "another case," (Dillmann), but they develop the illustration already presented still further and more forcibly.—**If its root becometh old in the ground** (הַזְקִין, inchoative Hiph., *senescere*), **and its trunk dieth in the dust** (comp. Isa. xl. 24), *i. e.*, if the tree die, not interrupted in its growth by the violent hand of man, while yet young and vigorous, but decaying with age, becoming dry and dead down to the roots.—**Through the scent of water** (*i. e.*, so soon as it feels the vivifying energy of water; comp. Judg. xvi. 9) [רֵיחַ, may be taken either subjectively of the scenting, or inhalation of water by the tree; or, better, of the scent which water brings with it. "When the English army landed in Egypt in 1801, Sir Sydney Smith gave the troops the sure sign that wherever date-trees grew there must be water." Vide R. Wilson's *History of the Expedition to Egypt*, page 18] **it sprouts** (again; comp. Ps. xcii. 14) **and puts forth boughs** (comp. ch. xviii. 16; xxix. 19), **like a young plant**; or also like a sapling newly planted (LXX.: ὡς νεόφυτον). That this description also is pre-eminently suitable to the palm appears from the fact that, as every oriental knows very well, in every place where this tree grows, water must be very near at hand, generally from the indestructible vitality and luxuriant fulness of this φίλυδρον φυτόν, (comp. Delitzsch on this passage. ["Even when centuries have at last destroyed the palm—says Masius in his beautiful and thoughtful studies of nature—thousands of inextricable fibres of parasites cling about the stem, and delude the traveller with an appearance of life." Del.]).

Vers. 10–12 present the contrast to the above: the hopelessness of man in death.

Ver. 10. **But man dies and is brought down** (חָלַשׁ here in the intrans. sense *confectum esse.* to be prostrated, to be down, whence the usual signification, "to be weak," is derived: [the Imperf., when transitive, is written יַחֲלשׁ; when intransitive, as here, יֶחֱלַשׁ]); **man expires** (וַיִּגְוַע, Imperf. consec., because the cheerless consequences of death are here further set forth), **and where is he?**—where does he then go to? what becomes of him? Comp. the similar yearning question in Eccles. iii. 21.

Ver. 11. **The waters flow away** [lit. roll off] **out of the sea, and a stream fails and dries up.**—This is the protasis of a simile, the apodosis of which is introduced, ver. 12, by וְ "so," as below in ver. 19, and as above in chap. v. 7; xi. 12 (in which latter passages indeed the figure follows, not precedes, the thing illustrated). Comp. the description, imitative of the present passage, in Isa. xix. 5, describing the drying up of the Nile (נָהָר, יָם) by a Divine judgment—a description which indeed the advocates of a post-solomonic authorship of our book regard as the original of the passage before us (*e. g.*, Volck, *de summa carm. Job sent.*, p. 31). [יָם here should be taken of an inland sea or body of water, a sense which the application of the word to the lake of Tiberias, Numb. xxxiv. 11; the Euphrates, Isaiah xxvii. 1; the Nile, see above, abundantly justifies. Such a drying up of large bodies of water is no uncommon phenomenon in the torrid regions of the East. —E.]

Ver. 12. **So man lies down and rises no more; till the heavens are no more, they awake not.**—עַד בִּלְתִּי שָׁמַיִם, until the failure, *i. e.*, the disappearance of the heavens (comp. the exactly equivalent phrase, עַד בְּלִי יָרֵחַ, Ps. lxxii. 7), the same in meaning with לְעַד לְעוֹלָם, Psalm cxlviii. 6. For according to the popular conception of the ancient Hebrews, the heavens endure for-ever: Ps. lxxxix. 30 [29]; Jer. xxxi. 35. When in Ps. cii. 27; Isa. li. 6; lxv. 17 the heavens are described as waxing old and being changed, this statement does not exclude their eternal existence; for the supposition of a destruction of the universe in the sense of its annihilation is everywhere foreign to the Hebrew Scriptures. The expression before us, "not to awake till the heavens are no more," is accordingly in any case equivalent to "not to awake for ever" [or "never to awake"], as the third member of the verse also clearly indicates: **and are never aroused out of their sleep**—they sleep a שְׁנַת עוֹלָם, Jer. li. 39, 57, an endless sleep of death. [It is assuredly straining the language, and at variance with the connection, and with Job's present mood, to assume in the expression an implication that when the phenomenal heavens should disappear, man would awake. How far Job's mind does reach out towards the idea of a resuscitation of humanity will be seen presently. Amid such fluctuations of thought and feeling as characterize his utterances, we are not to look for self-consistency, much less for a careful and exact expression of the highest forms of truth, whether as revealed elsewhere, or even as at times revealed to his own mind.—E.] How unchangeable the cheerless outlook on such an eternal condition of death in Sheol presents itself to Job, is shown by the vividly expressed wish which immediately follows that God, if it were

possible, would cause him again to emerge out of this condition, which, however, he immediately recognizes as a yearning which is absolutely incapable of being realized.

8. *Third Division: Fourth and Fifth Strophes:* Continuation and conclusion of the description of the hopelessness of man in the prospect of death: vers. 13–22.

Fourth Strophe: Vers. 13–17: [If God would only permit a hope of the cessation of His wrath, and of his restoration from Sheol, how joyfully he would endure] until the change should come; but now He punishes without pity his sins.]

Ver. 13. **Ah that Thou wouldst hide me** (Hiph. as in Ex. ii. 3) **in the realm of the dead, wouldst keep me secret until Thy wrath should change** (comp. the description of such a hiding from God's wrath in Isa. xxvi. 20; Ps. xxvii. 5; xxxi. 21 [20]), **wouldst appoint me a set time** (a חֹק, see on ver. 5), **and then remember me**—*viz.*, for good, in order to re-establish me in the fellowship of Thy grace, and cause me to live in the same. This last expression וְתִזְכְּרֵנִי accented with the emphasis of glowing passion, is the culmination of the yearning wish which Job here expresses, from which, however, he immediately recoils again, as from a chimerical idea which has no real foundation.

Ver. 14. **If man dies, will he live?**—*i. e.*, is it possible that he who has once died, will come to life again? The asyndetic introduction of this short but frequent question after the preceding verse, produces a contrast which is all the stronger. No answer to the question follows, because it is self-evident to the reader that it can be answered only in the negative. But strong as is his conviction of the impossibility of a return to life of the dead, equally sweet and gracious is the charm of the thought which dwells on the opposite possibility, which he has just expressed in the form of a wish. ["*If a man die, etc.*, finely natural interpretation of the cold reason and of doubt, striving to banish the beautiful dream and presentiment of a new bodily life with God; but in vain, the spirit tramples down the rising suspicion, and pursues more eagerly the glorious vision." DAV.] **All the days of my warfare would I wait, until my discharge** (lit. "my exchange," comp. chap. x. 17) **should come.**—Job uses the term "warfare" here somewhat differently from chap. vii. 1 to denote not only the remainder of his toilsome and troublesome days on earth, but "the whole dismal interval between the present and that longed-for goal" in the future when he should be released from Hades; this release is here, in accordance with the figure of military service, designated as an "exchange" or "discharge." [Hence the "change" here spoken of is not, as the old Jewish expositors, followed by some moderns, have explained it, the change produced by death. The word חֲלִיפָה, however, has here a double significance, which should be appreciated to realize the full beauty of the passage. In addition to its primary and principal meaning as expressing the discharge of the soldier whose term of hard service has expired, it suggests also the "sprouting" anew (יַחֲלִיף, ver. 7) of the trunks and roots of the tree which has been cut down. The חֲלִיפָה, in a word, which Job yearns for is a release from service which would be at the same time a "springing up" anew from death to life. That this double meaning is not forced, that it is a beautiful and happy stroke of genius, will not seem at all incredible to any one who will carefully trace out our author's masterly use of words in their various possibilities.—E.]

Ver. 15. **Thou wouldst call** (to wit, in this discharge [by Ewald and others referred to the forensic call to the final trial, wherein Job confidently hoped to be acquitted; but the connection here indicates rather the call of love, yearning after its object; "the voice of God returning to take His creatures to Himself" (DAV.)—E.], **and I would answer Thee** (would follow Thy call); **Thou wouldst yearn after the work of Thy hands** (chap. x. 3); *i. e.*, Thou, as Creator, wouldst feel an affectionate longing after Thy creature, which Thou hadst hitherto treated harshly, and rejected. "The true character of the relation of love between the Creator and His creature would again assert itself, it would become manifest that wrath is only a waning power (Isa. liv. 8), and love the true and essential necessity of His being." DEL. ["Job must have had a keen perception of the profound relation between the creature and his Maker in the past, to be able to give utterance to such an imaginative expectation respecting the future." SCHLOTT.] Although only a "phantasy of hope" (Schlott.), it still furnishes an unconscious prophecy of that which was accomplished in Christ's descent into Hades for the salvation of the saints of the Old Covenant.

Ver. 16. **For now Thou numberest my steps**, *i. e.*, for at this time Thou watchest every step and motion, as those of a transgressor, comp. chap. xiii. 27. כִּי עַתָּה, as in chap. vi. 21, introducing the contrast between a point of time on which the eye fixes in the future, and the sad reality of the present. [כִּי assigns the reason *for the wish* which forms the contents of vers. 13-15. It is not necessary, with Hirzel and Schlott., to supply any thing between vers. 15 and 16, as, *e. g.*, "Thou dost not yearn for Thy creature now, for," *etc.* The construction of Umbreit, *etc.*, which takes כִּי עַתָּה as an emphatic clause,="indeed now," is to be rejected.—E.]—**And dost not hold Thyself back on account of my sins.**—This is the most satisfactory rendering of לֹא תִשְׁמֹר עַל חַטָּאתִי. It is found already in Mercier, (*non reservas nec differs peccati mei punitionem*), and is of late advocated by Delitzsch [and Wordsworth. It seems to Del. "that the sense intended must be derived from שָׁמַר אַף, which means to keep anger, and consequently to delay the manifestation of it; Amos i. 11."] Dillmann's explanation gives the same sense: "Thou dost not pass over my sins;" a rendering, indeed, which rests on an emendation of the text to: לֹא תַעֲבֹר עַל־ח׳, which is favored in some measure by the version of the LXX. Also the rendering advocated by Ewald, Heilig.,

Schlott. and Hahn: "Thou givest no consideration to my sins" (to ascertain, namely, whether they do in truth deserve to be punished so severely), does not differ very essentially. Other explanations lack satisfactory support: such as those of the Rabbis, which differ widely among themselves: *e. g.* Raschi's: "Thou waitest not over my sins, *i. e.* to punish them;" Ralbag's: "Thou waitest not for my sins=repentance punishment;" Aben-Ezra's: "Thou lookest not except on my sins." The same may be said of the attempt of Rosenm., Hirzel and Welte to render the sentence as an interrogative without הֲ: "Dost Thou not keep watch over my sin?" [So E. V., Conant, Dav., Rod., Gesen., Fürst.—In view of ch. xiii. 27 *b*, it is not apparent why this rendering should be said to "lack satisfactory support." The preposition עַל cannot be urged against it, for it harmonizes well with the idea thus expressed; and the interrogative form gives vividness, force and variety to the passage. —E.]

Ver. 17. **Sealed up in a bag is my guilt.** פִּשְׁעִי, lit. "wickedness," as in ch. xiii. 23 b, here of the aggregate of Job's former transgressions (comp. ch. xiii. 26 *b*), of the sum total, the entire mass of guilty actions committed by him, which, as he must believe, is preserved and sealed up by God with all care as a treasure, to be used against him in his own time; comp. Deut xxxii. 34; Hos. xiii. 12. For the figurative expression: "to tie up in a bag,"=to keep in remembrance, comp. Ps. lvi. 9; 1 Sam. xxv. 29. Ewald, Hirzel, Renan, incorrectly explain the "guilt sealed in a bag" to be the judicial sentence of condemnation by God already issued against Job, which now only awaits execution; for of the preservation of such penal sentences in a bottle all oriental antiquity knows nothing whatever. [The figure is taken "from the mode of preserving collected articles of value in a sealed bag." Del.]—**And Thou hast devised additions to my transgressions**: lit. "and Thou hast still further stitched (to wit, other, new transgressions) on my transgressions; *i. e.* hast made mine iniquity still greater than it is, and punished it accordingly more severely than it deserves. This accusation which Job here prefers against God is a bold one; but it is too much to affirm that it is "pure blasphemy" (Dillm.), because the language of Job throughout is simply tropical, and his real thought is that God's *treatment* of him is as severe as if, in addition to his actual transgressions, he were burdened with a multitude of such as had been fabricated (comp. Hengstenberg on the passage). Hence the rendering of Ewald: "Thou hast patched up, sewed up my transgression" [E. V., Dillmann, Good, Wemyss, Bernard, Con., Barnes, Dav., Rod.], is equally unnecessary with the similar rendering of Umbreit, Vaih., Böttch.: "and Thou coverest up my sins." Substantially the right interpretation is given by Rosenmüller. Arnh., Hirz., Welte, Delitzsch, Hengst. [Gesen., Fürst, Noyes, Renan, Words.].

[The main argument in favor of the interpretation adopted here by Zöckler is that טפל means properly not to sew up, but "to sew on, patch on, and gen. to add." So Delitzsch. But (1): It looks very much like hyper-criticism to decide, from a very limited usage, that a word, the essential meaning of which is to sew, may mean to sew on, but cannot mean to sew up; or, if the essential meaning be to plaster, to patch, that it may mean to patch on to (to add a patch), but not to patch over. (2) The point becomes still weaker in a case where the word is used, as here, in a figurative, not a literal sense. (3) The parallelism favors the meaning to sew, or to patch up. It seems somewhat incongruous, after representing God as having sealed up transgressions in a bag, to represent Him in the next clause as stitching, patching, or fabricating other sins. On the other hand, the thought of sealing sin in a bag is suitably supplemented by the thought that the bag is not only officially sealed, but carefully sewed together; or if, with Bernard, we explain: "With such care dost Thou store up my iniquities in Thy bag, that if Thou seest the slightest possibility of its giving way in any part, so that some of them might slip out and be lost, Thou immediately stoppest up the hole with a patch." (4) Admitting that the apparent blasphemy of the expression may be explained away, as above by Zöckler, its admitted *audacity* still remains. But Job is not now in one of his Titanic moods of defiance. He resembles not so much Prometheus hurling charges against the Tyrant of the skies, as Hamlet, meditating pensively on death and the "undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveller returns," but with an infinitely purer pathos than is found even in the soliloquy of "the melancholy Dane." It is but a moment ago (ver. 15 *b*) that he recognized in a strain of inimitable beauty the yearning bent of Creative Love. He is now indeed complaining of the present severity of God's dealings with him, but the plaintive tenderness of that sentiment still floats over his spirit and lingers in his words, softening them into the tone of a subdued reproachful moan, very different from the bitter outcry of rebellious defiance.—E.]

Fifth Strophe: vers. 18-22. Conclusion: completing the gloomy delineation of that which in reality awaited Job, in opposition therefore to the yearning desire of his heart.

Ver. 18. **But in sooth a falling mountain crumbles away**: observe the paronomasia in the original between the participle נוֹפֵל describing הַר and יִבּוֹל) נָבֵל). [וְאוּלָם at the beginning as elsewhere strongly adversative, introducing in opposition to the *dream* of a possible restoration in the preceding strophe the stern *reality*, the inexorable and universal law, which dooms everything to destruction. The use of this conjunction here is a strong confirmation of the position maintained in the concluding remarks on ver. 17 that the sentiment of vers. 15-17 lingers also around vers. 16, 17, and that accordingly ver. 17 *b* cannot be a daring suggestion of the charge of fabricating iniquity against Job.—E.]—**And a rock grows old out of its place.** עָתַק is rightly rendered: "to grow old, to decay" by the LXX., and among moderns by Hirzel, Umbreit, Vaihinger, Schlottmann. The topical meaning: "to be

removed" is indeed admissible, and is supported by the Vulg., Rosenm., Ewald, Hahn, and generally by the majority of moderns. The more pregnant meaning of the passage, however, would be lost by the adoption of this latter rendering, which is simply prosaic in its simplicity.

Ver. 19. In this verse *a* and *b* continue the series of figures begun in ver. 18, which are intended to illustrate the unceasing operation of the Divine penalty or process of destruction decreed for men, whereas *c* first introduces that which is to be illustrated by means of the ו *adæquationis* (as in ch. v. 7; xi. 12; xii. 11). **Water hollows out stones** (comp. the Lat. *gutta cavat lapidem*); **its floods wash away the dust of the earth.** תִּשְׁטֹף, fem. sing., referring to the plural סְפִיחֶיהָ, according to Gesenius, § 146 [§ 143] 3, [Green. § 275, 4. The harshness of the construction which is necessitated by taking סָפִיחַ in the sense which belongs to it elsewhere of a self-sown growth, is shown in the rendering of E. V.: "Thou washest away the things which grow out of the dust of the earth." Moreover, the limitation—"self-sown"—is against this rendering, which would require rather some more comprehensive term, such as יְבוּל. The fem. suffix in סְפִיחֶיהָ originates in the same principle which determines the fem. form of the verb, and like the latter refers to מַיִם.—E.].—**And the hope of mortal man** [note the use of אֱנוֹשׁ, bringing man into the category of destructible matter.—E.]—**Thou destroyest**: *i. e.* just as incessantly and irresistibly as the physical objects here mentioned yield to the gradual processes of destruction in nature, so dost Thou cause man to perish without any hope of being brought to life again, and this too at once, suddenly (הֶאֱבַדְתָּ, Perf. of the accomplished fact. [For the form of the verb see Green, § 112, 3]). The four figures here used are not introduced to exemplify the idea of incessant change ruling in the realm of nature, whereas from man all hope of a change for the better in his lot is taken away (so Hahn, who takes the ו in *c* in the adversative sense, but they describe the processes of destruction in nature, and more especially in the lower sphere of inorganic nature, as types of the gradual ceaseless extinction to which man succumbs in death. This moreover is not to be understood as though Job contemplated those processes with a view to console himself with the thought that his destruction in death was a natural necessity, (Hirzel), but in order to exhibit as forcibly and thoroughly as possible the absolute hopelessness of his condition in prospect of the dark future which death holds up before him; see vers. 20-22, which admit of no other than this disconsolate sentiment for ver. 19 *c*. [The descending gradation in the series of objects from which the illustrations here are taken is quite noticeable—mountain—rock—stones—dust; and suggests at least the query whether we do not have here something more than four distinct emblems of decay, whether it is not intended to show a succession of stages in the process: the mountains crumbling into rocks, the rocks breaking down from age into stones, the stones wearing away into dust, and the dust being washed by the waters into the abyss; whether accordingly all nature is not thus resolving itself into the dust to which man too at the last returns What hope is there indeed for man, whose "house of clay is crushed like the moth" (ch. xiv. 19), when the doom even of the everlasting mountains is—dust!—E.].

Ver. 20. **Thou overpowerest him forever—then he passeth away.**—תקף with accus. if the person is not: "to assail" (Hirzel) [Con. Del.], but as in ch. xv. 24; Eccles. iv. 12, "to overpower," and לָנֶצַח is not "continually, evermore," but "forever;" comp. ch. iv. 20; xx. 7; xxiii. 7.—As to the emphatic וַיַּהֲלֹךְ, "then he passeth away," Greek *βαίνει, οἴχεται*, comp. ch. x. 21; also in respect of form the same poet. Imperf. in ch. xvi. 6, 22; xx. 25.—**Disfiguring his countenance, so Thou sendest him away**; *i. e.*, in the struggle of death, or when decay sets in, Thou makest him unlike himself, distortest his features, *etc.*, and so sendest him forth out of this life (שִׁלַּח as in Lev. xx. 23; Jer. xxviii. 16; the ו consecut. very nearly as in Ps. cxviii. 27).

Ver. 21. **Should his sons be in honor, he knows it not; if they are abased he perceives them not**: [ל after בִּין here of the direct object: in ch. xiii. 1 however as *dat ethicus.* Del.]. The same contrast between כָּבֵד, to come to honor, and צָעַר, to be insignificant, to sink into contempt, is presented in Jer. xxx. 19; for כָּבֵד comp. also Is. lxvi. 5. The mention of the children of the dead man has nothing remarkable about it, since Job is here speaking in general terms of all men, not especially of himself. It is somewhat different in ch. xix. 17; see however on the passage. The description in the passage before us of the absolute ignorance of the man who is in Sheol of that which takes place in the world above, reminds us of ch. iii. 13 seq. Comp. in addition Eccles. ix. 5, 6 (see Comm. on the passage).

Ver. 22. **Only his flesh in him feels pain, and his soul in him mourns**: *i. e.*, he himself, his nature, being analyzed into its constituent parts of soul and body (comp. ch. xvii. 16), perceives nothing more of the bright life of the upper world; he has only the experience of pain and sorrow which belongs to the joyless, gloomy existence of the inhabitants of Sheol, surrounded by eternal night. The brevity of the expression makes it impossible to decide with certainty whether Job here assumes that man carries with him to Sheol a certain corporeality (a certain residue, kernel, or some reflex of the earthly body), or whether he mentions the "flesh" along with the "soul" because (as is perhaps the case also in Is. lxvi. 24; Judith xvi. 17) he attributes to the decaying body in the grave a certain consciousness of its decay (Dillmann; comp. Delitzsch, who would cast on the departed soul at least "a painful reflection" of that process). The former view, however, is the more probable in view of

what is said in ch. xix. 27 (see below, Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks on ch. xix., No. 3). By means of עָלָיו, "in him," occurring in both members, the two factors of the nature belonging to the man who has died are emphatically represented as belonging *to him*, as being *his own;* the suffixes in בְּשָׂרוֹ and נַפְשׁוֹ are thus in like manner strengthened by this doubled עָלָיו as in Greek the possessive pron. by ἴδιος. It is not probable that אַךְ "only," is through a hyperbaton to be referred simply to עָלָיו, expressing the thought: "only he himself is henceforth the object of his experiences of pain and mourning, he concerns himself no more about the things of the upper world (Hirzel, Delitzsch), [Noyes, Schlott.]. This rendering is at variance with the position of the words, and with the doubled use of עָלָיו. Dillmann rightly says: "the limiting אַךְ belongs immediately not to the subject, but to the action: he no longer *knows* and *perceives* the things of the upper world, he is henceforth only conscious of pain, *etc.*" Hengstenberg on the contrary arbitrarily explains [and so Wordsworth]: The situation in ver. 22 is in general not that of the dead, but of one who is on the point of death, of whose flesh (animated as yet by the soul) alone could the sense of pain be predicted (?).

[Vers. 21, 22 are a description of the after-life in two of its principal aspects. (1) As one of absolute separation from the present, and so of entire unconsciousness and independence in regard to all that belongs to life on earth (ver. 21).—(2). As one of self-absorbed misery, the self-absorption being indicated by the repeated עָלָיו, and the double suffixes in each member of ver. 22. The thought of ver. 21 leads naturally to that of ver. 22. The departed knows nothing of the living, nothing of all that befalls those who during life were in the closest union with himself; the consciousness of *his own* misery fills him.

The description in ver. 22 of his experience of that misery is more obscure.—עַל *may* be rendered—"on account of": "only on his own account his flesh suffereth pain, *etc.*" The objection to this is its non-emphatic position, and the separation between it and אַךְ. In any case the suffix ־ָיו refers to the man, not (as Conant, Dav., Ren., Rod.) to "flesh" in *a*, and to "soul" in *b*, for in that case נֶפֶשׁ would require עָלֶיהָ. The proper rendering of עָלָיו therefore is "in him" (in = Germ. *an ; i. e.*, his flesh and spirit as *belonging to* him, as that with which he is invested).—But why connect the "flesh" here with the "soul?" The simplest explanation seems to be that the realm of the dead, the under-world, in its broadest extent embraces both the grave, where the body lies, and Hades where the soul goes, as may be seen in Ps. xvi. 10, where שְׁאוֹל and שַׁחַת are conjoined; and that accordingly, by poetic personification, the mouldering flesh is here represented as sharing the aching discontent, the lingering misery of the imprisoned soul. It is no uncommon thing even for us to speak of the comfort, rest, equality, *etc.*, of the grave, as though its occupants might have some consciousness of the same. So on the other hand it would seem that Job here introduces into the resting-place of the body something of that which made the place of the departed soul an object of dread. It *may be* indeed, as our Comm. suggests above, that the passage reflects some peculiarity in the opinion of antiquity touching the relation of the corporeal and spiritual parts of humanity, after death, but our grounds for affirming this are too precarious.—E.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

It is undeniable that Job in this reply to Zophar's attack, which at the same time closes the first colloquy, shows himself decidedly superior to the three friends not only in acuteness, high poetic flight of thought, and penetrative fiery energy of expression, but also in what may be called doctrinal correctness, or purity. In the latter respect he seems to have made progress in the right direction from the stand-point which he had previously occupied. At least he exhibits in several points a perception of sin which is in some measure more profound and accurate, in so far as he, notwithstanding that he repeats the emphatic asseveration of his innocence (see especially ch. xiii. 16,19), makes mention of his own sins, not simply of those of his opponents. No doubt it is one of his principal aims to criticize sarcastically and severely their one-sided wisdom (ch. xii. 2 seq.; xiii. 1 seq.); no doubt he censures with visible satisfaction the one-sided application which they make of their narrow doctrine of retribution, and holds (ch. xiii. 9) that if God in the exercise of rigid justice, should scrutinize *them*, the result would be anything but favorable to them! Now, however, more decidedly and explicitly than in his previous apologies, he includes himself also in the universal mass of those who are sinfully corrupt and guilty before God. He several times admits in the last division (ch. xiii. 23—xiv. 22) that by his sin he had furnished the inexorable Divine Judge, if not with valid and sufficient *cause* at least with *occasion* for the severe treatment which He had exercised toward him. Here belongs the prayer, addressed to God to show him how much and how grievously he had in truth sinned (ch. xiii. 23). Here also belongs the supposition which he expresses (ch. xiii. 26) that possibly it was the "transgressions of his youth" of which he was now called to make supplementary confession; and following thereupon we have his lamentation—which reminds us of David's penitential prayer (Ps. li. 7; comp. Ps. xiv. 3)—concerning the nature of human depravity, which he represents as embracing all, and organically transmitting itself, so that no one is excepted from it (ch. xiv. 4)—an utterance which agrees in substance with the proposition previously advanced by Eliphaz (ch. iv. 17), but which more profoundly authenticates the truth under consideration, so that the Church tradition is perfectly justified in finding in it one of the cardinal *sedes doctrinæ* on the subject of ori-

ginal sin. Here finally belongs the description, involving another distinct confession of his own sinfulness, in which he shows how God unsparingly punishes his sin, lies in wait, as it were, for it, and carefully notes it in His book (a thought which is favored by the corresponding Hebrew expression "to seal transgression in a bag")—nay, more, seems to interest Himself in wilfully enlarging this, His register of sins (ch. xiv. 16, 17). With these several indications of a more profound and comprehensive consciousness of sin, which are indeed still far from signifying a genuine contrite submission beneath God's righteous discipline, that true penitence which God's personal interposition at last works in him (ch. xlii. 2 seq.), there stands immediately connected another evidence of progress in Job's frame of mind, which is also contained in the closing division of this discourse, especially in the 14th chapter, which is characterized by wondrous beauty and astonishing power. Job utters here for the first time, if not the hope, at least *the yearning desire for a release from the state of death* (ch. xiv. 13-17). He prays that, instead of being shut up in an eternally forlorn separation from God in the gloomy realm of shadows, he may rather be only kept there for a season, until the Divine wrath is ended, and then, when the Creator should remember His creature, to be restored to His fatherly love and compassion. This does not indeed amount to a hope that He would one day be actually released from Hades; it is simply a dream, born of the longing of this sorely tried sufferer, which imagination summons before him as a lovely picture of the future, of which, however, he himself is the next moment assured that it can never be a reality! If we should still call it a hope, we must in any case keep in view the wide interval which separates this forlorn flame of hope, flickering up for once only, and then immediately dying out, from that hope of a resurrection which with incomparably greater confidence is expressed in ch. xix. 25 seq. At best we can but say, with Ewald: "The hope exists only in imagination, without becoming a certainty, while the speaker, whom it has surprised, only follows out the thought, how beautiful and glorious it would be, were it really so." This simple germ-hope of a resurrection, however, acquires great significance as a step in the doctrinal and ethical course of thought in our book. For it is the clear radiance of an unconscious prophecy of the future deliverance of spirits out of their prison through Christ's victory over the powers of darkness (Matt. xii. 40 seq.; Luke xxiii. 43; Eph. iv. 8 seq.; Phil. ii. 10 seq.; Col. ii. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 18 seq.; Rev. i. 18; Heb. ii. 14), which here shines forth in the depths of a soul beclouded by the sorrows of death. On the other side Job expresses so strong a yearning after permanent reconciliation with his Creator, so pure a representation of the nature of the communion of man with God, as a relation which behooves to be of eternal duration, that this very intensity of the religious want and longing of his heart carries with it, in a measure, the pledge that his yearning was not in vain, or that his ἐλπίζειν παρ' ἐλπίδα would one day be fulfilled. Comp. on the one side what is said by Schlottmann, who (on ver. 15) rightly emphasizes the thought that "Job must have had a deep experience in the past of the inwardness of the relation between the creature and his Creator, if he was able to give such an expression to it as this dreamy hope of the future;"—on the other side by Delitzsch, who not less strikingly and beautifully points out "how totally different would have been Job's endurance of suffering, if he had but known that there was really a release from Hades," and how at the same time in the wish of Job that it might be so, there is revealed "*the incipient tendency of the growing hope.*" "For," he continues, "the author of our book confirms us in what one of the old writers says, that the hope of eternal life is a flower which grows on the brink of hell. In the midst of the hell of the feeling of God's wrath, in which Job is sunk, this flower blooms for him. In its blooming, however, it is not yet a hope, but a longing. And this longing cannot unfold itself into a hope, because no light of promise shines into the night which rules in Job's soul, and which makes the conflict yet darker than it is in itself."

2. When we compare Job's frame of mind, and religious and moral views of the world, as indicated in this discourse, with those expressed in his former discourses, we find these two points of superiority and progress: a more correct insight into sin, and above all, in his relation to the Divine Creator, an inward sense of fellowship blossoming into what is at least a lively longing after eternal union with God. In other respects, however, the present outpouring of his sorely tempted and afflicted heart exhibits retrogression rather than progress. The illusion of a God tyrannically tormenting and hostilely persecuting him has a stronger hold upon him than ever before (see especially ch. xiii. 15 seq.). And this illusion is all the stronger in that, on the one hand, he finds within himself that the witness of his conscience to his innocence is more positive than ever (ch. xiii. 16, 19), while on the other hand, he is unable to free himself from the preconceived opinion which influences him equally with the three friends, which admits no other suffering to be possible for men than that of penal retribution for sin (comp. ch. xiii. 23, 26; xiv. 16 seq.). There arises thus a strange conflict between his conscience, which is comparatively pure, and the gloomy anxieties produced by that preconceived notion, and by the contemplation at the same time of his unspeakable wretchedness—a conflict which, in proportion as he neither can nor will relinquish his own righteousness, urges him to cast suspicion on God's righteousness, and to accuse Him of merciless severity. This unsolved antinomy produces within him a temper of agonizing gloominess, which in ch. xiii. 13 seq. expresses itself more in presumptuous bluster and Titan-like storming against God's omnipotence, in ch. xiv. 1 seq. more in a tone of elegiac lamentation and mourning. Immediately connected herewith is the melancholy, deeply tragical character which attaches to his utterances from beginning to end of this discourse. For it has been truly remarked of the passage in ch. xii. 7 seq., in which, with a view to surpass and eclipse

that which had been said in the right direction by his three predecessors, he describes the absolute majesty of God in nature and in the history of humanity, that it is "a night-scene (*Nachtgemälde*), picturing the catastrophes which God brings to pass among the powers of the world of nature and of humanity;" and that the one-sidedly abstract, negative, repelling, rather than attractive representation of God's wisdom, is the reflection of the midnight gloom of his own feelings, which permits him to contemplate God essentially only on the side of His majesty, His isolation from the world, and His destructive activity. ["For the wisdom of God, of which he speaks, is not the wisdom that orders the world in which one can confide, and in which one has the surety of seeing every mystery of life sooner or later gloriously solved; but this wisdom is something purely negative. . . . . Of the justice of God he does not speak at all, for in the narrow idea of the friends he cannot recognize its control; and of the love of God he speaks as little as the friends, for as the sight of the Divine love is removed from them by the one-sidedness of their dogma, so is it from him by the feeling of the wrath of God which at present has possession of his whole being. Hegel has called the religion of the Old Testament the religion of sublimity; and it is true that, so long as that manifestation of love, the incarnation of the Godhead, was not yet realized, God must have relatively transcended the religious consciousness. From the book of Job, however, this view can be brought back to its right limits; for, according to the tendency of the book, neither the idea of God presented by the friends, nor by Job, is the pure undimmed notion of God that belongs to the Old Testament. The friends conceive of God as the absolute One, who acts only according to justice; Job conceives of Him as the absolute One, who acts according to the arbitrariness of His absolute power. According to the idea of the book, the former is dogmatic one-sidedness, the latter the conception of one passing through temptation. The God of the Old Testament consequently rules neither according to justice alone nor according to a 'sublime whim.'" Delitzsch I.: 239, 240].

It has been still further truly remarked that the mournfulness of his lamentations over the hopeless disappearance of man in the eternal night of the grave—in contemplating which he is led to regard the changes which take place in the vegetable kingdom as more comforting and hope-inspiring than the issue of man's life, with which he can compare only the processes of destruction and the catastrophes of inorganic nature (chap. xiv. 7 seq., 18 seq.)—has its echo in classical heathenism in such passages as the following from Horace (*Od.* IV. 7, 1):

"Nos ubi decidimus
Quo pius Æneas, quo dives Tullus et Ancus,
Pulvis et umbra sumus."

Or like this from Homer (*Il.* VI. 146 seq.):

"Like the race of leaves
Is that of humankind. Upon the ground
The winds strew one year's leaves; the sprouting wood
Puts forth another brood, that shoot and grow
In the spring season. So it is with man;
One generation grows while one decays;".
(Bryant's *Transl.*)

Or like this meditation of Simonides (*Anthol. Gr. Appendix*, 83):

"Nought among men unchangeable endures.
Sublime the truth which he of Chios spoke:
'Men's generations are like those of leaves!'
Yet few are they who, having heard the truth
Lodge it within their hearts, for hope abides
With all, and in the breasts of youth is planted."

Or like this elegy from *Moschus* (III. 106 seq.):

"The meanest herb we trample in the field,
Or in the garden nurture, when its leaf,
At winter's touch is blasted, and its place
Forgotten, soon its vernal buds renews,
And, from short slumber, wakes to life again.
Man wakes no more!—man valiant, glorious, wise,
When death once chills him, sinks in sleep profound,
A long, unconscious, never-ending sleep."
(Gisborne.)

Or like that saying of the Arabian panegyrist of Muhamed, Kaabi ben-Sohair:—"Every one born of Woman, let his good fortune last never so long, is at last borne away on the bier, *etc.*": or like that still more impressive description in the Jagur Veda: "While the tree that has fallen sprouts again from the root, fresher than before, from what root does mortal man spring forth when he has fallen by the hand of death?"

Finally, it has been rightly shown that besides the tone of mourning and hopeless lamentation which sounds through this discourse, it is also pervaded by a tone of bitterness and grievous irritation on the part of Job, not only against the friends (this being most forcibly expressed in ch. iv. 7 seq.) but even in a measure against God, especially in those passages where he presumptuously undertakes to argue with Him (ch. xiii. 13 seq.), and where he even reproaches Him with making fictitious and arbitrary additions to His list of charges, after the manner of the friends when they calumniated him and invented falsehoods against him (ch. xiv. 17; see on the passage). A singular contrast with this tone of defiant accusations is furnished in the plaintive pleading tone with which he submits the twofold condition on which he is willing to prosecute his controversy with God, to wit, that God would allow a respite for a season from his sufferings, and that He would not terrify and confound him with His majesty (ch. xiii. 20-22). It is everywhere the terrible idea of a God who deals with men purely according to His arbitrary caprice, not according to the motives of righteousness and a Father's love, this "phantom which the temptation has presented before his dim vision instead of the true God,"—it is this which drives him to these passionate outbreaks, which in several respects remind us of the attitude of a hero of Greek tragedy towards the fearful might of an inexorable Fate. ["This phantom is still the real God to him, but in other respects in no way differing from the inexorable ruling fate of the Greek tragedy. As in this the hero of the drama seeks to maintain his personal freedom against the mysterious power that is crushing him with an iron arm, so Job, even at the risk of sudden destruction, maintains the steadfast conviction of his innocence in opposition to a God who has

devoted him, as an evil-doer, to slow but certain destruction. It is the same battle of freedom against necessity as in the Greek tragedy. Accordingly one is obliged to regard it as an error, arising from simple ignorance, when it has been recently maintained that the boundless oriental imagination is not equal to such a truly exalted task as that of representing in art and poetry the power of the human spirit, and the maintenance of its dignity in the conflict with hostile powers, because a task that can only be accomplished by an imagination formed with a perception of the importance of recognizing ascertained phenomena. In treating this subject, the book of Job not only attains to, but rises far above, the height attained by the Greek tragedy: for on the one hand it brings this conflict before us in all the fearful earnestness of a death-struggle; on the other however it does not leave us to the cheerless delusion that an absolute caprice moulds human destiny. This tragic conflict with the Divine necessity is but the middle, not the beginning nor the end, of the book; for this god of fate is not the real God, but a delusion of Job's temptation. Human freedom does not succumb, but it comes forth from the battle, which is a refining fire to it as conqueror. The dualism, which the Greek tragedy leaves unexplained, is here cleared up. The book certainly presents much which, from its tragic character, suggests this idea of destiny, but it is not its final aim—it goes far beyond: it does not end in the destruction of its hero by fate; but the end is the destruction of the idea of this fate itself." Delitzsch I. 242 seq.].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The points of light which these three chapters exhibit in a doctrinal and ethical respect, have a background of gloom, here and there of profound blackness. The homiletic expositor nevertheless finds in them in rich abundance both texts for exhortation and comfort, and themes for didactic edification. Here belongs of course the beautiful passage containing the physico-theological argument for an infinitely powerful and wise Maker and Ruler of the world (ch. xii. 7-12)—a passage which in detail indeed exhibits no progressive development, but which does nevertheless present an occasion for such a teleologic advance of thought, in so far as it dwells first on the animal world, then on the realm of human life and its organic functions, in order to produce from both witnesses for a Supreme Wisdom ordering all things. But here still further belongs the description which follows of the Divine majesty and strength which display themselves in the catastrophes of human history (ch. xii. 13–25),—a description which may be made the foundation of reflections in the sphere of historical theology, or ethical theology, as well as the physico-theological argument. Here belongs again the passage which follows, in which Job sharply censures the unfriendly judgment and invidious carping of his opponents (ch. xiii. 1-12)—a passage which reminds us in many respects of New Testament teachings, as *e. g.* of Matt. vii. 1-5, and of Matt. xxiii. 2 seq.—Finally, we may put in this class the lamentation in the closing division, especially in ch. xiv., over the vanity and perishableness of the life of man on earth, which is compared now to a driven leaf, now to the process of mouldering, or being devoured by the moth, now to a fading flower, or a rock worn away and hollowed out by the waters, together with those passages which are interwoven with this lamentation, in which he glances at the beginning of life, poisoned by sin, and at its dismal outlook in the future appointed for it after death by the Divine justice, which is contemplated by itself, isolated from grace and mercy.—The following extracts from the older and later practical expositors may serve to indicate how these themes may be individually treated.

Ch. xiii. 7-10. BRENTIUS: All creatures proclaim the Creator, and cry out in speech that cannot be described: God has made me—as Paul also says (Rom. i. 19; comp. Ps. xix. 1 seq.). If any one therefore properly considers the nature of beasts, birds, fishes, he will discover the wonderful wisdom of the Creator (—certain examples of the same being here brought forward, such as the instinct which the deer and the partridge exhibit, the wonderful strength of the little sucking-fish [Echineïs]). Thus by the natures of animals the invisible majesty of God is made visible and manifest. For not only did God create all things, but He also preserves, nourishes and sustains all things: the breath, whether of beasts or of men, is all lodged in His hand.—COCCEIUS: What all these things severally contribute to the knowledge of the Creator, as it would be a most useful subject of thought, so it is too vast to be here set forth by us. Suffice it that Natural Theology is here established by Job. . . . When he says "this" (זאת, ver. 9), he doubtless points out individual things. He thus confesses that every single thing was made and is governed by God, not only masses of things, and the universe as a whole, as the Jews dream. In fact individual animals, plants, *etc.*, utter their testimony to the Divine efficiency. . . . These opinions, either by the light of nature, or the intercourse of the fathers, were transmitted even to the gentiles.—HENGSTENBERG: In order to make the wisdom of the friends quite contemptible, Job attributes to the *animals* a knowledge of the Divine omnipotence and wisdom, their existence being an eloquent proof of those attributes, so that *they* can become teachers of the man who should be so blind and foolish as to fail to know the divine omnipotence and wisdom. That which can be learned from *brutes*, that as to which we may go to school to them, Job will not be so foolish as not to know, neither will he need to learn it first from his wise friends. . . . Just as here the animals, so in Ps. xix. the heavens are represented as declaring the glory of God, which is revealed in them. Jehovah, the most profound in significance of the Divine names, here bursts forth suddenly out of its concealment, the lower names of God being in this connection unsatisfactory. Jehovah, Jahveh, the One who Is, the absolute, pure Being, is most appropriately the name by which to designate the First Cause of all existences.

Ch. xii. 11-13. COCCEIUS: If the mind judges

concerning those things which are presented either by signs, such as words, or by themselves, as food to the palate, whether they are true or false, useful or injurious; if by experience (by which many things are seen, heard, examined), by the knowledge of very many things, and of things hidden, and by sagacity it is fitted to make a proper use of things—does it not behoove that God, who gave these things should be omniscient without weakness, nay, with fulness of power, so that all things must obey His nod? For He beholds not, like man, that which belongs to another, but that which is His own. Nevertheless neither is judgment given to man for nought, but so that he may have some power of doing that which is useful, of refusing, or of not accepting that which is hurtful. Much less is God's wisdom to be exercised apart from omnipotence or sovereignty over all creatures.

Ch. xii. 16 seq. CRAMER: Not only true but also false teachers are God's property; but He uses the latter for punishment (2 Thess. ii. 10), yet in such a way that He knows how to bring forth good out of their ill beginning. The Lord is a great king over all gods; all that the earth produces is in His hand (Ps. xcv. 3); even false religions must serve His purposes (comp. Oecolampadius, who remarks on ver. 16 *b*: I refer this to ψευδοθρησκείας, or false religions, of which the whole earth is full; he says here, that they come to be by His nod and permission). Such might and majesty He displays particularly toward the mighty kings of earth, to whom He gives lands and people, and takes them away again, as He wills (Dan. iv. 29).—ZEYSS: Rulers, and those who occupy their place, should diligently pray to God that He would keep them from foolish and destructive measures (in diets, council-chambers, in regard to wars, *etc.*), in order that they may not plunge themselves and their subjects into great distress (1 Kings iii. 9).

Ch. xiii. 14 seq. BRENTIUS: You see from this passage that it is harder to endure the liability and dread of death than death itself. For it is not hard to die, seeing that whether disease precedes or not, death itself is sudden; but to hear in the conscience the sentence of death (scil.—Thou shalt surely die!) this indeed is most hard! This voice no man can hear without despair, unless, on the other hand, the Lord should say to our soul: I am thy salvation!—WOHLFARTH: "Earthly things lost—*little* lost; honor lost—*much* lost; God lost—*all* lost!" thus does Job admonish us.

Ch. xiii. 23–28. OECOLAMPADIUS: See the stages by which the calamities come, swelling one above the other. (1) To begin with, the face is hidden, and friendship is withheld; then (2) enmity is even declared; (3) persecution follows, and that without mercy, or regard for frailty; (4) reproaches and grave accusations are employed, and the memory of past delinquencies is revived; (5) guards are imposed, lest he should escape, and fetters in which he must rot. (Mercier and others, including of late Hengstenberg, have called attention to these same five stages.)—ZEYSS (on ver. 24): Besides the external affliction, internal trials are generally added.—(On ver. 26): Even the sins of youth God brings to judgment in His own time (Ps. xxv. 7). Think of that, young men and women, and flee youthful lusts!

Ch. xiv. 1 seq. BRENTIUS: Man's misery is set forth by the simile of the flower; for bodily beauty and durability can be compared to nothing more suitably than to the flower and the shadow. . . . Verily with what miseries man is filled, is too well known to need reciting. For nowhere is there any state or condition of men which does not have its own cross and tribulation; and thus all things everywhere are filled with crosses. . . . The thing to be done, therefore, is not to shun the cross, but to lay hold on Christ, in whom every cross is most easily borne.—ZEYSS: Although no man is by nature pure and holy (ver. 4), true believers nevertheless possess through Christ a two-fold purity: (1) in respect of their justification; (2) in respect of their sanctification and renewal: Heb. i. 3; ix. 14; 1 John i. 7, *etc.*

Ch. xiv. 7 seq. ZEYSS: As a tree sprouts up again, so will men, who have been cut down by the axe of death, germinate again out of the grave on the Last Day; John v. 28, 29.—HENGSTENBERG: The prospect of a future life here vanishes away from Job. How indeed could it be otherwise, seeing that he has lost altogether out of his consciousness and experience the true nature of God, on which that hope rests, God's justice and mercy? In these circumstances the belief in an endless life must of necessity perish within him, for to this faith there was not given until the latter part of the Old Dispensation any firm declaration from God to which it could cling, while before that it existed rather in the form of a longing, a yearning, a hope. Further on, however, [in Job's history] it again recovers its power.

Ch. xiv. 13–17: See Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks, No. 1.

Ch. xiv. 18 seq. CRAMER: Nothing on earth is so firmly established, but it must perish; and they who occupy themselves with the things of earth, must perish in them (Sir. xiv. 20 seq.; 1 John ii. 16 seq.).—ZEYSS: Although mountains, stones and rocks, yea, all that is in the world, are subject to change, God's word, and the grace therein promised for believers, stand fast forever; Ps. cxvii. 2; Isa. liv. 10.—VICT. ANDREÆ: Like an armed power the feeling of his present cheerless condition again overpowers Job, and again the feeble spark is extinguished, which had just before (vers. 13-17), illumined his soul with so tender a gleam of hope. To his former reflections on nature (vers. 7-12) he now opposes the fact, no less true, that even that which is most enduring in nature itself, such as mountains, rocks, and soils, must gradually decay. And so it seems to him now, in accordance with this fact, as though human life also were destined by God only to endless annihilation. Death it is—with its pale features so suddenly disfiguring the human countenance—which again stands in all its horror, and annihilating power, before his despairing soul!

SECOND SERIES OF THE CONTROVERSIAL DISCOURSES.

THE ENTANGLEMENT INCREASING:

CHAPTERS XV—XXI.

I. Eliphaz and Job: XV—XVII.

A.—Eliphaz: God's punitive justice is revealed only against evil-doers.

CHAPTER XV.

1. Recital in the way of rebuke of all in Job's discourses that is perverted, and that bears testimony against his innocence:

CHAPTER XV. 1–19.

1 Then answered Eliphaz the Temanite, and said,

2 Should a wise man utter vain knowledge,
and fill his belly with the East wind?
3 Should he reason with unprofitable talk?
or with speeches wherewith he can do no good?
4 Yea, thou castest off fear,
and restrainest prayer before God.
5 For thy mouth uttereth thine iniquity,
and thou choosest the tongue of the crafty.
6 Thine own mouth condemneth thee, and not I:
yea, thine own lips testify against thee.

7 Art thou the first man that was born?
or wast thou made before the hills?
8 Hast thou heard the secret of God?
and dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself?
9 What knowest thou that we know not?
what understandest thou, which is not in us?
10 With us are both the gray-headed and very aged men,
much elder than thy father.
11 Are the consolations of God small with thee?
is there any secret thing with thee?

12 Why doth thine heart carry thee away,
and what do thy eyes wink at,
13 that thou turnest thy spirit against God,
and lettest such words go out of thy mouth?
14 What is man, that he should be clean?
and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?
15 Behold He putteth no trust in His saints;
yea, the heavens are not clean in His sight.
16 How much more abominable and filthy is man,
which drinketh iniquity like water?

17 I will show thee, hear me;
and that which I have seen I will declare;
18 which wise men have told—
from their fathers—and have not hid it:
19 unto whom alone the earth was given,
and no stranger passed among them.

2. A didactic admonition on the subject of the retributive justice of God in the destiny of the ungodly.

VERSES 20-35.

20 The wicked man travaileth with pain all his days,
and the number of years is hidden to the oppressor.
21 A dreadful sound is in his ears:
in prosperity the destroyer shall come upon him.
22 He believeth not that he shall return out of darkness,
and he is waited for of the sword.
23 He wandereth abroad for bread, saying, Where is it?
he knoweth that the day of darkness is ready at his hand.
24 Trouble and anguish shall make him afraid;
they shall prevail against him as a king ready to the battle.

25 For he stretcheth out his hand against God,
and strengtheneth himself against the Almighty:
26 he runneth upon him, even on his neck,
upon the thick bosses of his bucklers;
27 because he covereth his face with his fatness,
and maketh collops of fat on his flanks:
28 and he dwelleth in desolate cities,
and in houses which no man inhabiteth,
which are ready to become heaps.
29 He shall not be rich, neither shall his substance continue,
neither shall he prolong the perfection thereof upon the earth.
30 He shall not depart out of darkness;
the flame shall dry up his branches,
and by the breath of his mouth shall he go away.

31 Let not him that is deceived trust in vanity,
for vanity shall be his recompense.
32 It shall be accomplished before his time,
and his branch shall not be green.
33 He shall shake off his unripe grape as the vine,
and shall cast off his flower as the olive.
34 For the congregation of hypocrites shall be desolate,
and fire shall consume the tabernacles of bribery.
35 They conceive mischief, and bring forth vanity,
and their belly prepareth deceit.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

This second discourse of Eliphaz is again the longest of the attacks made on Job by his three opponents in this second series or act. Not only by its length, but also by its confident, impassioned tone, it gives evidence of being a deliverance of opinion by the oldest and most distinguished of the three, in short by their leader. Apart from certain indications of increased violence, however, it adds nothing at all that is new to that which had been previously maintained by Eliphaz against Job. Its *first* principal division (vers. 2-19) subjects that which was erroneous in Job's discourses to the same rigid criticism and censure, which culminates in a renewed and more emphatic application to Job of the doctrine advocated in the former discourse, of the impurity of all before God (vers. 14-19; comp. ch. iv. 17 seq.). The *second* division (vers. 20-35) is occupied with a prolonged dissertation on the destiny of the ungodly, as an example repeating itself in accordance with God's righteous decree, and full of warning for Job. The first division comprises three strophes of five verses each, together with a shorter group of three verses (vers. 17-19), which forms the transition to the following division. The latter consists of three strophes, of which the middle one numbers six verses, the first and last each five.

2. *First Division:* Censuring the perversity of Job in his discourses, and pointing out the evidences which they gave of his guilt; vers. 2-19.

First Strophe: Introduction [Job's discourses disprove his wisdom, injure religion, and testify against himself] vers. 2-6.

Ver. 2. **Doth a wise man utter [or, answer with] windy knowledge?**—[Eliphaz begins each one of his three discourses with a question]. Job had clearly enough set himself forth as a Wise Man, ch. xii. 3; xiii 2. Hence this ironical contrast between this self-praise and the "windy" nature (comp. ch. viii. 2; xvi.

3) of that which he really knew.—**And fill his breast** [*sein Inneres*, his inward parts] **with the stormy East wind?**—So Delitzsch, whose translation is to be preferred on the score of taste to the more common and literal version: "and fill his belly with the East wind?" even if we grant that בֶּטֶן is not, without further qualification, synonymous with לֵב, and consequently not to be taken as a mere designation of the "thinking inner part" of man (although in favor of this application of it, as maintained by Delitzsch, we might cite, if not ver. 35 of this chapter, at least ch. xxxii. 18 seq.). In any case קָדִים, "East wind," is here (as well as in Hos. xii. 2 [1] a stronger synonym of רוּחַ, "wind," and so describes the *violence*, or the ceaseless noisy bluster and roar of Job's discourses; and the "belly," or the inward part, which must take into itself such discourses and labor for their refutation, appears as though it were *a sail*, or *tent-canvas inflated* by a heavy storm!

Ver. 3. An explanatory clause subordinate to the preceding interrogative clause:—**Arguing with speech which availeth nought, and with words by which one can do no good.**—The Inf. Absol. הוֹכֵחַ can be taken neither as an interrogative finite verb (Hirzel, Renan: *se defend il-par des vaines paroles?* ["for though the Inf. Absol. is so used in a historical clause (ch. xv. 35) it is not in interrogative." Del.]), nor as the subject (Ewald: "to reprove with words profiteth not," *etc.*—as if this useless striving with *words* were opposed to a more efficient contention by the use of facts) [which yields indeed, as Dillmann remarks, a good meaning, to wit, that mere words availed nothing for self-justification, when opposed by facts, as *e. g.* the fact of his suffering, which was presumptive evidence against him. But such a *contrast* is not expressed. The אַף of ver. 4 does not at all express it]. Rather is it joined to the preceding finite verbs in the sense of an ablative gerund (*redarguendo s. disputando*); comp. Ewald, § 280, *a*.

Ver. 4. **Yea more, thou [thyself] dost make void the fear of God.** אַף, a strong copula, adding a new and more serious charge, like the phrase "over and above;" comp. ch. xiv. 3. [אַתָּה, emphatic—"even thou," who dost fancy thyself to be called on to remind us of the fear of God, ch. xiii. 9 seq.] יִרְאָה, absolute, as in ch. iv. 6; הֵפֵר, "to remove, make void," as in ch. v. 12 [lit. to break, destroy; Rodwell: "thou dost break down piety"].—**And diminishest** (devout) **meditation before God**—שִׂיחָה לִפְנֵי־אֵל, according to Ps. cii. 1; cxix. 97, 99, the same with "devotion, pious prayerful reflection" [should not therefore be rendered "prayer," although prayer is a prominent element in it. It includes the whole *meditative* side of piety, that over which a sanctified *sentiment* rules, as יראה includes the *practical* side, over which *conscience* rules. Eliphaz charges therefore that the tendency of Job's speech and conduct is to undermine piety in its most important strongholds, to injure it in its most vital points.—E.]. In regard to the form שִׂיחָה [with feminine ending] see ch. iii. 4.—גָּרַע, *detrahere*, to derogate from, to prejudice [Fürst: to weaken, to lessen]; comp. below ver. 8, where it conveys more the sense of "drawing to one's-self" [reserving, *attrahere*], and ch. xxxvi. 7, where it means "withdrawing."

Ver. 5. **For thy transgression teaches thy mouth**: *i. e.*, thou allowest thyself to be wholly influenced in what thou sayest by thy sin, thou showest thyself, even in thy words, to be entirely ruled by it. So correctly the Vulg., Raschi, Luther, Dillm. [Ewald, Schlottm.], for the probability is in favor of עֲוֹנְךָ, which stands first, being the subject of the sentence. Moreover, the rendering which has latterly become current (since Rosenm., Umbreit, Hirzel, *etc.*): "thy mouth teaches, *i. e.*, exposes [E. V. 'uttereth'] thine iniquity," is at variance with the usual sense of אִלֵּף, which signifies "to teach, to instruct," not "to show, to declare." [To which Schlottmann adds that this rendering secures a better connection between the first and second members of the verse. It exhibits to us "in a manner alike original and suitable, the internal motive from which Job's presumptuous and still crafty discourses proceed"].—**And thou choosest the speech** [lit. **the tongue**] **of the crafty**: (עֲרוּמִים essentially as in ch. v. 12) *i. e.*, thou doest as crafty offenders do, who, when accused, hypocritically set themselves forth as innocent, and indeed even take the offensive against their accusers, (as Job did in ch. xiii. 4 seq.). ["The perverse heart teaches the guilty man presumptuously to assail God, and at the same time so to arrange his words that in appearance he is filled with the greatest zeal for the piety which he really undermines." Schlott.] The rendering of Rosenm., Hirzel [Noyes, Conant, Carey], *etc.*" "while thou (although thou) choosest, *etc.*" is less satisfactory, and goes with the rendering of the first member, which is controverted above.

Ver. 6. **Thy mouth condemns thee** (see ch. ix. 20) **and not I, and thy lips testify against thee.**—The mouth is here personified as a *judge* pronouncing an unfavorable decision, declaring one guilty, while at the same time the lips figure as *witnesses*, or *accusers* (עָנָה בְּ, a *vox forensis;* for the masc. יַעֲנוּ בָךְ after the fem. שְׂפָתֶיךָ comp. Prov. v. 2; xxvi. 23). Comp. still further the New Testament parallel passage, Matth. xii. 37. ["These words, according to Eliphaz's meaning, place Job's guilt not merely in his words, but rather set forth these as confirming the sinful actions, which he is assumed to have committed on account of the sufferings which have been appointed for him." Schlott.].

Second Strophe: Vers. 7–11. [Ironical questioning in regard to the extraordinary superiority which Job's conduct implied that he arrogated to himself].

Ver. 7. **Wast thou born as the first man?** (רִאישׁוֹן ["רִאישׁוֹן] is the original form, which appears again in Josh. xxi. 10, and is retained by the Samaritans; רִאשׁוֹן, instead of which we

have in ch. viii. 8 רִישׁוֹן, which has passed into general use, and is hence chosen by the K'ri." Dillm.] in the constr. st followed by the collective אָדָם; hence lit. "as first of men.—Delitzsch takes אָדָם as predicate nominative: "wast thou as the first one born as a man?" a rendering which is altogether too artificial. The question presupposes that the first-created man, by virtue of his having proceeded immediately from God's hand, possessed the deepest insight into the mysteries of the Divine process of creation. Comp. the Adam Kadmon of the Kabbalists, the Kajomorts of the Avesta (πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος of the Manicheans), the Manu (*i. e.*, "the thinking one") of the Brahmanic legends of creation as well as the ironical proverb of the Hindûs: "Aye. aye, he is the first man, no wonder he is so wise!" (Roberts, Oriental Illustrations, p. 276). ["Eliphaz evidently gives in these two verses the conception of a First Man, (like the Manu of the Hindûs), possessed as such of the highest wisdom, a being who before the foundations of the earth were laid, was present, a listener, as it were, to the deliberations concerning creation in the council of God, and thus a partaker at least of creative wisdom (ch. xxviii. 23 seq), without being identified with the Divine חכמה." Dillm. "Many erroneously understand this expression as signifying simply the greatest antiquity, so that the sense would be: dost thou combine in thyself the wisdom of all the centuries, from the creation of the world on? This conception would be unsuitable for the reason that it would have no reality corresponding to it, the first man being conceived of as dead long since." Schlott.] —**And wast thou brought forth before the hills?**—חוֹלָלְתָּ, passive of חוֹלֵל "to whirl" [hence to writhe, be in pain, travail], Ps. xc. 2.—Precisely the same expression occurs in Prov. viii. 25 *b*, an utterance of God's Eternal Wisdom, which is doubtless an intentional allusion to this passage. [So also Delitzsch.—Schlottmann, on the contrary, thinks it indisputable that this passage contains an allusion, if not to the passage in Proverbs, then to an original source common to both, so that the sense would be: "art thou the essential Divine Wisdom itself, through which God created the world?" The verse thus furnishes a pregnant and energetic progression of thought and expression. "Being born before the hills," and "sitting in God's council," could not be taken as *accidentia sine subjecto*, which without having a real substratum, are sarcastically predicated of Job, but they must be regarded as inhering in a definite subject, with which Job is now compared, as immediately before he was compared with the first man; and this makes it necessary that we should think of the ante-mundane Wisdom described in Prov. viii., which from an early period was brought into special relation to the first man. Ewald accordingly paraphrases vers. 7, 8: "Thou, who wouldest be wiser than all other men, dost thou stand perchance at the head of humanity, like the Logos, the first alike in age, and in worth and nearness to God?"]

Ver. 8. **Didst thou listen in the council of Eloah?**—סוֹד, as in Jer. xxiii. 18; comp. Ps. lxxxix. 8 [7]. ["Here God is represented in Oriental language as seated in a *divan*, or council of state, . . . and El. asks of Job whether *he* had been admitted to that council." Barnes.]—**And dost thou keep back wisdom to thyself?** חָכְמָה without the article, denoting the absolute divine wisdom; comp. ch. xi. 6; xii. 2; Prov. viii. 1 seq. In regard to גרע, see above on ver. 4. [Gesenius: "Dost thou reserve all wisdom to thyself?" like the Arabic, to absorb, drink up. Fürst: "to snatch away: hast thou purloined wisdom to thyself? *i. e.* captured it as a booty."] The representation of the First Man, endowed with the highest wisdom, a witness of God's activity in creating and ordering the world, still lies at the bottom of these questions. Comp. God's questions at a later period to Job: ch. xxxviii. 3 seq. ["Having obtained the secret of that council, art thou now keeping it wholly to thyself—as a prime minister might be supposed to keep the purposes resolved on in the divan?" Barnes.]

On ver. 9 comp. ch. xii. 3; xiii. 2, to which self-conscious utterances of Job Eliphaz here replies.

Ver. 10. **Both the gray-headed and the aged [hoary] are among us**; or: "*also among us* are the gray-headed, are the aged;" for the גַּם is inverted, as in ch. ii. 10, and as in the parallel passages there cited. בָּנוּ is equivalent to: "in our generation, in our race." We are to think, on the one side, of Job's appeal to the aged men, to whom *he* owed his wisdom, ch. xii. 12; on the other side, of the proverbial wisdom of the "sons of the East," to whom the three friends as well as Job belonged (1 Kings iv. 30), especially that of the Temanites; see above on ch. ii. 11. The supposition of Ewald, Hirzel, Dillmann, *etc.*, that Eliphaz, "in modestly concealed language," referred *to himself*, as the most aged of the three, has but little probability, for the statement: "there is also among us (three) a gray-headed, an aged man," would in the mouth of El. himself have in it something exceedingly forced, if he had thereby meant himself; and the collective use of the sing. שָׂב and יָשִׁישׁ presents not the slightest grammatical difficulty. Still further, if El. had (according to *b*) declared himself "more abundant in days than Job's father," he would have said of himself that which would have been simply monstrous. The correct explanation is given among the moderns by Rosenm., Arnheim, Umbreit, Delitzsch. ["It will be seen (*infra* xviii. 3) that in the discussion carried on between Job and his friends, he is not always regarded as a single individual, but rather as the representative of the party whose views he holds, that of the philosophers, namely, who wish to understand and account for everything: while his friends, as the contrary, represent the orthodox party, whose principle it is to declare everything that comes from God good and right, whether it be comprehensible or incomprehensible to the human intellect. Hence the plural בְּעֵינֵיכֶם, in *your* eyes, used by Bildad (though speaking to Job alone), in the chapter alluded to, *i. e.* in the eyes of you philosophers. In like manner, in

the verse before us El. says: Both gray-headed and very aged men are amongst us. Amongst us orthodox people." Bernard.]

Ver. 11. **Are the consolations of God** (comp. ch. xxi. 2) **too little for thee** (lit. are they less than thee—comp. Num. xvi. 9; Is. vii. 13)? [The irony of the question is severe: Too little for *thee* are the consolations of *God?* The words reveal at the same time the narrow self-complacency of the speaker, the consolations of God being such as he and the friends had sought to administer, for which El., however, claims a *Divine* value and efficacy.—E.], **and a word so gentle with thee?** *i. e.* a word which, like my former discourse, dealt with thee so tenderly and gently. On לָאַט, elsewhere לְאַט, lit. "for softness," *i. e.* softly, gently [*e. g.* Is. viii. 6 of the soft murmur and gentle flow of Siloah], comp. Ew. § 217, *d;* § 243, c. Eliphaz here identifies his former address to Job with a consolation and admonition proceeding from God himself; as in fact in delivering the same (see ch. iv. 12 seq.), he ascribed the principal contents of it to a Divine communication. In regard to the gentleness which he here claims for that former discourse, comp. especially ch. iv. 2: v. 8, 17 seq.

Third Strophe: vers. 12-16. [Severe rebuke of Job's presumptuous discontent, founded on man's extreme sinfulness.]

Ver. 12. **Why does thy heart carry thee away?** לָקַח, *auferre, abripere.* [לֵב here for deep inward agitation, excitement of feeling (Delitzsch: "wounded pride"). Why dost thou allow the stormy discontent of thy bosom to transport thee beyond thyself?—E.]—**And why twinkle thine eyes?** רזם, ἅπ. λεγ = Aram. and Arab. רמז, "to wink, to blink," said here of the angry, excited snapping, or rolling of the eyes [referring, according to Renan, to such a manifestation of angry impatience with the hypocrisy of El. at this point of his discourse; and similarly Noyes: "why this winking of thine eyes?"]. Comp. Cant. vi. 5 (according to the correct interpretation, see my remarks on the passage).

Ver. 13. Depending on the preceding verse: **That thou turnest against God thy snorting.** רוּחַ here meaning angry breathing, θυμός ["thus expressed because it manifests itself in πνέειν (Acts ix. 1), and has its rise in the πνεῦμα (Eccl. vii. 9)." Delitzsch], as in Judg. viii. 3; Prov. xvi. 32; Is. xxv. 4; comp. above Job iv. 9.—**And sendest forth words out of thy mouth?** מִלִּין (comp. ch. iv. 2) as parallel with רוּחַ can mean here only vehement, intemperate speaking, passionate words, not empty speaking, as Kamphu. explains it.

Ver. 14 repeats the principal proposition of Eliphaz in his former discourse (ch. iv. 17-20), with an accompanying reminder of Job's confession in ch. xiv. 4, which was in substantial harmony therewith. On יְלוּד אִשָּׁה comp ch. xiv. 1.

Ver. 15. **Behold, in His holy ones He puts no trust.** קְדֹשִׁים, the same as עֲבָדִים, ch. iv. 18, and hence used of the angels [see on ch. v. 1].—**And the heavens are not pure in His eyes.** שָׁמַיִם is neither here, nor in Is. xlix. 13 (comp. Luke xv. 18, 21; Matt. xxi. 25), to be taken as a synonym of מַלְאָכִים, or of אַנְגְּלֵי מְרוֹמָא (Targ.), as many commentators explain from the Targumists down to Hirzel, Heiligst., Welte [Schlott., Carey, Ren.], *etc.* Rather, as the parallel passage in ch. xxv. 5 incontestably shows, it designates *the starry heavens*, which are here contemplated in respect of their pure brilliancy, and their physical elevation above the impure earthly sphere. So correctly Umbreit, Delitzsch, Dillmann. ["In comparison with the all-transcending holiness and purity of God, the creatures which ethically and physically are the purest, are impure. How in the representations of antiquity ethical and physical purity and impurity are throughout used interchangeably is well enough known." Dillmann.] The angels are indeed regarded as inhabiting the heavenly spheres, as is indisputably proved by the phrase צבא השמים (1 Kings xxii. 19; Is. xxiv. 21; Ps. cxlviii. 2; comp. Gen. ii. 1), and the fact that the Holy Scriptures everywhere speak of angels and the starry heavens together. Comp. Del. on this passage and on Gen. ii. 1; Hengstenberg; Ewald, *K.—Ztg.*, 1869; Preface, No. 3. 4; Zöckler: *Die Urgeschichte der Erde und des Menschen* (1868), p. 12 seq.; also below, on ch. xxxviii. 7.

Ver. 16. **Much less then** (אַף כִּי, *quanto minus*, like אַף above in ch. iv. 19) **the abominable and corrupt** (נֶאֱלָח, lit. soured, one corrupted by the ζύμη κακίας, 1 Cor. v. 8, one "thoroughly corrupted,' Del.), **the man who drinks iniquity like water**, *i. e.* who is as eager to do iniquity, shows as much avidity for sin, as a thirsty man pants for water; comp. the repetition of this same figure by Elihu, also Ps. lxxiii. 10; Prov. xxvi. 6; Sir. xxiv. 21. The whole description relates to the moral corruption of mankind generally, of which Eliphaz intentionally holds up before Job "a more hideous picture" (according to Oetinger) than the latter himself had given in ch. xiv. 4, because he has in view the impurity, ill-desert, and need of repentance of Job himself. Comp. still further what he says ch. v. 7 on the spark-like proneness of man to sin and its penalty.

Fourth Strophe: vers. 17-19. Transition to the didactic discourse which follows in the form of a *captatio benevolentiæ.*

Ver. 17. **I will inform thee** (comp. ch. xiii. 17), **listen to me, and that which I have seen will I relate.**—זֶה is neuter, as in Gen. vi. 15, or like הוּא above in ch. xiii. 16, and זֶה־חָזִיתִי is a relative clause; comp. Ges. § 122 [§ 120], 2 —חָזָה needs not (with Schlottm.) be understood in the sense of an ecstatic vision, of the prophetic sort, seeing that in ch. viii. 17; xxiii. 9; xxiv. 1; xxvii. 12, *etc.*, it denotes also the knowledge or experience of sensible things. Moreover, as ver. 18 shows, Eliphaz makes a very definite distinction between that which is now to be communicated and a Divine revelation of

whatever sort. [As Dillmann observes, that which is communicated by a direct revelation from God does not need to be supported by the wisdom of antiquity].

Ver. 18. **That which wise men declare without concealment from their fathers.**—This verse, which is an expression of the object of וַאֲסַפֵּרָה, coördinate with זֶה־חָזִיתִי, is added without ו, because it is substantially identical with that which Eliphaz "had seen." מֵאֲבוֹתָם belongs not to וְלֹא כִחֲדוּ (so the ancient versions, and Luther) but to the logically dominant verb יַגִּידוּ, to which the וְלֹא כִ is subjoined as an adverbial qualification. "To declare and not to hide" is equivalent to a single notion, "to declare without deception," precisely like John i. 20, *ὁμολογεῖν καὶ οὐκ ἀγνεῖσθαι.*

Ver. 19. A more circumstantial description of אֲבוֹתָם:—**To whom alone the land was given** (to inhabit), **and through the midst of whom no stranger had forced his way.**—[Zöckler takes the verb עָבַר here not in the sense of a chance sojourning in a land, or traveling through it, but in the sense of a forcible intrusion, *war gedrungen;* a national amalgamation resulting from invasion. The language will include a foreign admixture from whatever source.—E.]. Seeing that הָאָרֶץ denotes here with much more probability "the land" rather than "the earth" (and so again in ch. xxii. 8; xxx. 8), and that what is expressly spoken of is the non-intrusion of strangers (זָרִים), Schlottmann's view that the passage refers to the first patriarchs, "the nobler primitive generations of mankind," who as yet inhabited the earth alone, is to be rejected. The reason why Eliphaz puts forward the purity of the generation of his forefathers as a guarantee of the soundness and credibility of their teachings is that "among 'the sons of the East' purity of race was from the earliest times considered as the sign of highest nobility" (Del.) ["The meaning is, 'I will give you the result of the observations of the *golden age* of the world, when our fathers dwelt alone, and it could not be pretended that they had been corrupted by foreign philosophy; and when in morals and in sentiment they were pure." Barnes. "Eliph.," says Umbr., "speaks here like a genuine Arab." The exclusiveness and dogmatic superciliousness which are to this day characteristic of Oriental nationalities are doubtless closely associated with the race-instinct which here finds expression. In proportion as a people, either from lack of courage, or from an effeminate love of luxury, or from a sordid love of gain prostrates itself to foreign influences, and carries the witness of its degradation in the impurity of its blood, it cannot, in the judgment of an oriental sage, produce, or transmit, pure and sound doctrine.—E.]. It is unnecessary herewith to assume that the age of Eliphaz, in contrast with the boasted age of the fathers, was a period of foreign domination, like the Assyrian-Chaldean period in the history of Israel (Ewald, Hirzell, Dillmann). Or granting that such a period is referred to—although we are under no *necessity* of understanding either זָר or עָבַר בְּתוֹכָם of warlike invasions—still nothing could be deduced from the passage in favor of the post-solomonic origin of our book: comp. on ch. xii. 24.

3. *Second Division:* An admonitory didactic discourse on the retributive justice of God as exhibited in the fate of the ungodly: vers. 20-35. ["Now follows the doctrine of the wise men, which springs from a venerable primitive age, an age as yet undisturbed by any strange way of thinking (modern enlightenment and free thinking, as we should say), and is supported by Eliphaz's own experience." Delitzsch. "It is not so much the *fact* that the evil-doer receives his punishment, in favor of which Eliphaz appeals to the teaching handed down from the fathers, as rather *the belief in it*, consequently in a certain degree the dogma of a moral order in the world." Wetzstein in Delitzsch].

First Strophe: Vers. 20-24. Description of the inward discontent and the restless pain of an earthly-minded and wicked man who defies God, and cares not for Him.

Ver. 20. **So long as the wicked liveth,** (lit., all the days of the wicked) **he suffereth torment** (מִתְחוֹלֵל, lit. he is writhing and twisting, *viz.*, from pain), **and so many years as are reserved for the oppressor** ["which according to ver. 32, are not very many," Dillm.] (עָרִיץ, tyrant, one who commits outrageous violence, as in ch. xxvii. 13; vi. 23; Ps. xxxvii. 35; Is. xiii. 11, *etc.*). The second member, in which מִסְפַּר שָׁנִים is an [adverbial] accusative clause, and נִצְפְּנוּ לֶעָרִיץ a relative clause depending upon it, resumes the temporal clause, "all the days of the wicked," which for the sake of emphasis stands at the beginning of the entire sentence. The LXX. renders differently: *ἔτη δὲ ἀριθμητὰ δεδομένα δυνάστῃ;* and similarly Delitzsch: "and a fixed number of years is reserved for the oppressor," a rendering however which gives a much flatter thought than our exposition. Against the rendering of the Targ., Pesh., and Vulg. [also E. V.] "and the number of years is *hidden* to the oppressor," it may be urged that in that case the reading must have been מִן הֶעָרִיץ. [Not necessarily.—לְ is often used as a sign of the *dativus commodi* or *incommodi* where we should expect מִן.—*E. g.*, Mic. ii. 4 אֵיךְ יָמִישׁ לִי, where the removal of the nation's portion *from* it, is represented by the preposition לְ, because of the injurious consequences *to* it. So here the hiding of the number of the oppressor's years *from* him is represented by לְ, because of the misery this causes *to* him. On the other hand it may be said in favor of this construction that it is much simpler and stronger, that it introduces an additional thought, such as the change of עָרִיץ for רָשָׁע might lead us to expect (Del.), and that it is in entire harmony with the context. The central thought of the passage, the essential element of the oppressor's misery is apprehension, anxiety, the premonition of his doom. How the darkness of this feature

of the picture is deepened by this stroke—"the number of his years is laid up in darkness," so that he knows not when, or whence, or how the blow will fall.—Furthermore the rendering "hidden" seems more suitable for נִצְפַּן than "reserved," in the sense of "determined," being more vivid, and more closely connected with the subjective character of the description. Even if we render it by "reserved," the idea of "hidden" should be included.—E.].

Ver. 21 seq., describe more in detail the restless pain of soul, or the continual הִתְחוֹלֵל of the wicked. [It is doubtful whether the following description is to be limited to the evil-doer's anxiety of spirit, or whether it includes the realization of his fears in the events of his life. On the whole Delitzsch decides, and apparently with reason, that as the real crisis is not introduced until further on, and is then fully described, the language in vers. 21-24 is to be understood subjectively.—E.].

Ver. 21. **Terrors** (the plural פחדים only here) **sound** [lit.: the sound of terrors] **in his ears; in** (the midst of) **peace the destroyers fall upon him**; or, if we regard שׁוֹדֵד not as a collective, but as singular (comp. ch. xii. 6): "the destroyer falls upon him." As to בוא with the accus. in the sense of "coming upon any one," comp. ch. xx. 22; Prov. xxviii. 22.

Ver. 22. **He despairs** (lit., he trusts not, he dares not) **of returning out of the darkness** (*viz.*, of his misfortune, see vers. 25, 30), **and he is marked out for the sword.** צָפוּ, the same with צָפוּי (which form is given by the K'ri and many MSS.) Part. pass. of צפה, signifies literally, "watched, spied out," which yields a perfectly good sense, and makes both the middle rendering of the Participle, ("anxiously looking out for the sword"—so the Pesh. and Vulg.) and Ewald's emendation to צָפוּן, seem superfluous.

Ver. 23. He wanders about for bread: "Ah where?" [*i. e.*, shall I find it]? The meaning is obvious: in the midst of super-abundance he, the greedy miser, is tortured by anxieties concerning his food—a thought which the LXX. [also Wemyss and Merx], misunderstanding the short emphatic interrogative אַיֵּה, "where" [for which they read אַיָּה, "vulture"], have obscured, or rather entirely perverted by their singular translation: *κατατέτακται δὲ εἰς σῖτα γυψίν*: ["he wanders about for a prey for vultures," Wem.]. With אַיֵּה comp. the similarly brief הִנֵּה in ch. ix. 19.—**He knows that close by him** [lit. as in E. V., "ready at his hand"], (בְּיָדוֹ, like עַל־יְדֵי ch. i. 14 לְיַד, "near, close by," Ps. cxl. 6 (5); 1 Sam. xix. 3) **a dark day** (lit. day of darkness; comp. ver. 22) **stands ready**—to seize upon him and to punish him (נָכוֹן, as in ch. xviii. 12).

Ver. 24. **Trouble and anguish terrify him.** צַר וּמְצוּקָה here not of external, but of internal need and distress, hence equivalent to anguish and alarm; comp. ch. vii. 11.—**It overpowereth him** (the subj. of תִּתְקְפֵהוּ is either מְצוּקָה or, with a neuter construction, the unknown something, the mysterious Power [which suggests the comparison that follows]) **as a king ready for the onset.**—כְּמֶלֶךְ cannot belong to the object of the verb, as rendered by the LXX. ["like a leader falling in the first line of the battle"] and the Targ. ["to serve the conqueror as a foot-stool"], but only to the subject. The deadly anguish, which suddenly seizes on the wicked, is compared to a king, armed for battle, who falls upon a city; comp. Prov. vi. 11.—The meaning of the Hapaxleg. כִּידוֹר (= כְּדוֹר, Ew., § 156, *b*) is correctly given on the whole by the Pesh. and Vulg., although not quite exactly by *proelium.* The Rabbis, Böttch., Del., *etc*, render it better by "the round of conflict, the circling of an army" ["the conflict which moves round about, like tumult of battle," Del.]; but Dillmann best of all, after the Arabic כרר by "onset, storming, rush of battle;" for this is the only meaning that is well suited to עָתִיד לְ, *paratus ad*, as well as to the principal subject מֶלֶךְ.

Second Strophe: Vers. 25-30. The cause of the irretrievable destruction of the wicked is his presumptuous opposition to God, and his immoderate greed after earthly possessions and enjoyments. The whole strophe forms a long period, consisting of a doubled antecedent (marked by the double use of כִּי, ver. 25 and ver. 27), and a consequent, vers. 29, 30.

Ver. 25. **Because he has stretched out his hand against God** (in order to contend with Him), **and boasted himself against the Almighty.** [As indicated in the introductory remark above, כִּי at the beginning is not "for" (E. V.), introducing a reason for what precedes, but "because," the consequent of which is not given until ver. 29 seq.] יִתְגַּבָּר, lit. "to show oneself a hero, a strong man;" *i. e.*, to be proud, insolent; comp. ch. xxxvi. 9; Is. xlii. 13.

Ver. 26 continues the first of the two antecedents, so that יָרוּץ is still under the regimen of כִּי in ver. 25 . . . **has run against Him with** (erect) **neck** (comp. ch. xvi. 14) **with the thick bosses** (lit. with the thickness of the bosses, comp. Ewald, § 293, *c*) **of his shields.** In *a* the proud sinner is represented as a single antagonist of God, who בְצַוָּאר, *i. e.*, *erecto colle*, (comp. Ps. lxxv. 6 [5]) rushes upon Him; in *b* he is become a whole army with weapons of offense and defense, by virtue of his being the leader of such an army.

Ver. 27. Introducing the second reason [for ver. 29 seq.], consisting in the insatiable greed of the wicked.—**Because he has covered his face with his fatness** (comp. Ps. lxxiii. 4-7), **and gathered** (עָשָׂה here in the sense of a natural production or putting forth, as in ch. xiv. 9) **fat upon his loins.**

Ver. 28. **And abode in desolated cities, houses which ought not to be inhabited,** לֹא יֵשְׁבוּ לָמוֹ, lit. "which they ought not to inhabit for themselves;" the passive rendering of ישׁב [Gesen., Del.] is unnecessary, the meaning of the expression in any case being, (*domus non*

habitandæ) **which are destined for ruins.**—We are to think of an insolent, sacrilegious, mocking, avaricious tyrant, who fixes his residence—whether it be his pleasure-house, or his fortified castle—in what is and should remain according to popular superstition, an accursed and solitary place, among the ruins, it may be, of an accursed city; Deut. xiii. 13-19; comp. Josh. vi. 26; 1 Kings xvi. 34; also what is reported by Wetzstein (in Delitzsch I. 267 *n.*) concerning such doomed cities among modern orientals.* Hirzel altogether too exclusively takes the reference to be to a city cursed in accordance with the law in Deut. (*l. c.*)—against which Löwenthal and Delitzsch observe quite correctly that what is spoken of here is not the rebuilding forbidden in that law, but only the ***inhabiting*** of such ruins Possibly the poet may have had in mind certain particular occurrences, views, or customs, of which we have no further knowledge. Perhaps we may even suppose some such widely-spread superstition as that of the Romans in relation to the *bidentalia* to be intended. [Noyes, Barnes, Renan, Rodwell, *etc.*, introduce ver. 28 with "therefore," making it the consequence of what goes before.—Because of his pride and self-indulgence, the sinner will be driven out to dwell among ruins and desolations. To this view there are the following objections. (1) It deprives the language of the terrible force which belongs to it according to the interpretation given above. (2) It leaves the description of the sin referred to in ver. 27 singularly incomplete and weak. This would be especially noticeable after the climactic energy of the description of the sin previously referred to in vers. 25, 26. Having seen the thought in ver. 25 carried to such a striking climax in ver. 26, we naturally expect to find the thought *suggested* rather than expressed in ver. 27 carried to a similar climax in ver. 28. (3) After dooming the sinner to dwell an exile among "stone-heaps," (גַּלִּים), it seems a little flat to add, "he shall not be rich," if the former circumstance, like the latter, is a part of the penalty.—E.].

Vers. 29, 30. The apodosis: (Therefore) **he does not become rich** (Hos. xii. 9 [8]), **and his wealth endures not** (has no stability, comp. 1 Sam. xiii. 14), **and their possessions** (*i. e.*, the possessions of such people) **bow not down to the earth.**—This rendering is in accordance with the interpretation now prevalent of מִנְלָם = מִנְלֶה, (with the suffix ָם) from a root (which is not to be met with) נלה, = Arab. nal, "to attain, to acquire," and so used in the sense of *quæstum, lucrum* (comp. the post-biblical מָמוֹן, *μαμωνᾶς*). A possession "bowing down to the earth" is *e. g.* a full-eared field of grain, a fruit-laden tree, a load of grain weighing down that in which it is borne, *etc.* In view of the fact that all the ancient versions present other readings than מִנְלָם—*e. g.*, LXX : צִלָּם [adopted by Merx]; Vulg. אצלם, *radicem suam:* Pesh. מִלִּים, words; Targ. מִנְהוֹן, *etc.*—the attempts of several moderns to amend the text may to some extent be justified. Not one of these however, yields a result that is altogether satisfactory, neither Hupfeld's מִכְלָה (*non extendet in terra caulam*), nor Olshausen's כַּגָּלָם ("their sickle does not sink to the earth"), nor Böttcher's מִמְלָם ("their fullness"), nor Dillmann's וְלֹא יַטֶּה לָאָרֶץ שִׁבֳּלִים, "and he does not bow down ears of corn to the earth." [Carey suggests that there may be a transposition here, and that instead of מנלם we should read נמלם from root נמל "to cut;" the translation then being: "neither shall the cutting (or offset) of such extend in the earth." The verbal root נלה found only in Isa. xxxiii. 1 (כַּנְּלֹתְךָ, Hiph. Inf. with Dagh. dirimens for כְּהַנְלֹתְךָ) seems to signify *perficere*, to finish; hence E. V. here renders the noun "perfection." Bernard likewise "accomplishment, achievements." For נטה the meaning "to spread, extend," is preferred by Good, Lee, Noyes, Umbreit, Renan, Con., Rodwell, *etc.* (E. V., "prolong"). The preposition ל however suits better the definition "to bow down," which on the whole is to be preferred. —E.]

Ver. 30. **He does not escape out of the darkness** (of calamity, ver 22); **a fiery heat** [lit. a flame] **withereth his shoots, and he passes away** (וְיָסוּר forming a paronomasia with the לֹא יָסוּר of the first member) **by the blast of His** [God's] **mouth**; comp. ch. iv. 9. In the second member the figure of a plant, so frequent throughout our book, previously used also by Eliphaz (comp. ch. v. 3, 25 seq.) [and already suggested here according to the above interpretation of 29 *b*], again makes its appearance, being used in a way very similar to ch. viii. 16 seq.; comp. also ch. xiv. 7. The parching heat here spoken of may be either that of the sun, or of a hot wind (as in Gen. xli. 6; Ps. xi. 6).

Third Strophe: Vers. 31–35. Describing more in detail the end of the wicked, showing that his prosperity is fleeting, and only in appearance, and that its destruction is inevitable.

Ver. 31. **Let him not trust in vanity—he is deceived** (נִתְעָה, Niph. Perf. with reflexive sense: lit. he has deceived himself) [Renan:

* "As no one ventures to pronounce the name of Satan because God has cursed him (Gen. iii. 14), without adding *'alah el-la'ne.* 'God's curse upon him!' so a man may not presume to inhabit places which God has appointed to desolation. Such villages and cities, which, according to tradition have perished and been frequently overthrown by the visitation of Divine judgment, are not uncommon on the borders of the desert. They use places, it is said, where the primary commandments of the religion of Abraham (*Din Ibrahim*) have been impiously transgressed. Thus the city of Babylon will never be colonized by a Semitic tribe, because they hold the belief that it has been destroyed on account of *Nimrod's* apostasy from God, and his hostility to His favored one *Abraham.* The tradition which has even been transferred by the tribes of Arabia Petræa into Islamism of the desolation of the city of *Higr* (or *Medain Salih*) on account of disobedience to God, prevents any one from dwelling in that remarkable city, which consists of thousands of dwellings cut in the rock, some of which are richly ornamented; without looking round, and muttering prayers, the desert ranger hurries through, even as does the great procession of pilgrims to *Mekka*, from fear of incurring the punishment of God by the slightest delay in the accursed city."

Insensé!] **for vanity shall be his possession** [תמורה; Ges., Fürst., Con., *etc.*, like E. V. "recompense:" Delitzsch: "not *compensatio*," but *permutatio, acquisitio;* and so Ewald and Zöckler —Eintausch, *exchange*]. שָׁוְא, written the first time שָׁו, is used here essentially in the same sense as in ch. vii. 3, and hence = delusion, vanity, evil. In the first instance the sense of emptiness, deception predominates, in the second that of calamity (the evil consequences of trusting in vanity). For the sentiment comp. ch. iv. 8; Hos. viii. 8; and the New Testament passages which speak of sowing and reaping; Gal. vi. 7 seq.; 2 Cor. ix. 6

Ver. 32. **While his day is not yet** (lit. "in his not-day," *i. e.*, before his appointed time has yet run its course; comp. ch. x. 22; xii. 24), **it is fulfilled,** *viz.*, the evil that is to be exchanged, it passes to its fulfillment; or also: the exchange fulfills itself, תִּמָּלֵא referring back immediately to תְמוּרָתוֹ, ver. 31,—so Hirzel, Dillmann. **And his palm-branch** (כִּפָּה as in Isa. ix. 13; xix. 15) **is no longer green,** is dry, withered. The whole man is here represented as a palm-tree, but not green and flourishing, as in Ps. xcii. 13 (12), but as decaying with dried up branches—by which branches we are not to understand particularly his children, especially seeing that only one is mentioned instead of several.

Ver. 33. **He loses [or shakes off] like a vine his grapes** (lit., his unripe grapes; בֶּסֶר or בֹּסֶר = ὄμφαξ, late or unripe grape; comp. Isa. xviii. 5; Jer. xxxi. 29; Ezek. xviii. 2) **and casts down, like an olive, his blossoms,** *i. e.*, without seeing fruit, this, as is well-known, being the case with the olive every other year, for only in each second year does it bear olives in anything like abundance; comp. Wetzstein in Delitzsch [I. 272 *n.* "In order to appreciate the point of the comparison, it is needful to know that the Syrian olive-tree bears fruit plentifully the first, third, and fifth years, but rests during the second, fourth, and sixth. It blossoms in these years also, but the blossoms fall off almost entirely without any berries being formed." Add the following from Thomson's *Land and the Book:* "The olive is the most prodigal of all fruit-bearing trees in flowers. It literally bends under the load of them. But then not one in a hundred comes to maturity. The tree casts them off by millions, as if they were of no more value than flakes of snow, which they closely resemble. So it will be with those who put their trust in vanity. Cast off they melt away, and no one takes the trouble to ask after such empty, useless things, *etc.*" I. 72]. The verb יַחְמֹס in *a* is variously rendered by commentators; *e. g.*, "broken [man bricht, 'ח' impersonal] as from a vine are his unripe grapes," Schlott.; or: "He (God) tears off as of a vine his young grapes" (Del., Hahn); or: "he (the wicked) wrongs as a vine his unripe grapes" (Hupfeld). The rendering given above (Ewald, Hirzel, Dillmann) [E. V., Con., Noy., Carey, Ren., Rod.], *etc.*), is favored by the parallelism of the second member, which shows that the "injuring, damaging" (חָמַס as in Lam. ii. 6; Prov. viii. 36, *etc.*), proceeds from the wicked himself. A reference to the process of cutting off the sour grape for the manufacture of vinegar (Wetzstein, Delitzsch) is altogether too remote here.—In regard to the variety of figures here derived from the vegetable kingdom, comp. further Ps. xcii. 13 (12) seq.; Hos. xiv. 6 seq.; Sir. xxiv.; and in general my *Theol. Naturalis*, p. 218 seq.

Ver. 34. **For the company of the profligate is barren.**—חָנֵף as in ch. viii. 13; xiii. 16 גַּלְמוּד (ch. iii. 7) is here and in ch. xxx. 3 used as a substant. in the sense of "stark death" (LXX.: θάνατος), barrenness, hard rock, comp. Matth. xiii. 5; and עֵדָה signifies here not indeed specially the family, as in ch. xvi. 7, but still the family circle, the kinsfolk, tribe, or clan. —**And fire devours the tents of bribery:** *i. e.*, the fire of the Divine sentence (comp. ch. i. 16) consumes the tents built up by bribery, or the tents of those who take bribes (οἴκους δωροδεκτῶν, LXX.).

Ver. 35. **They** (the profligate, for חָנֵף in ver. 34 was collective) **conceive** (are pregnant with) **misery, and bring forth calamity.**—אָוֶן and עָמָל, synonyms, as in ch. iv. 8; comp. the parallel passages Ps. vii. 15 (14); Isa. xxxiii. 11; lix. 4. The infinitives absolute in *a*, which are put first for emphasis, are followed in *b* by the finite verb: **and their body prepares deceit,** *i. e.*, their pregnant womb (not their "inward part," as Del. renders it) matures deceit, ripens falsehood, *viz.*, for themselves; comp. ver. 31. For הֵכִין, to prepare, to adjust, comp. ch. xxvii. 17; xxxviii. 41; for מִרְמָה, "deception," Gen. xxvii. 35; xxxiv. 13; Mic. vi. 11; Prov. xi. 1, *etc.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Job's persistence in holding what the friends assume to be a delusion, and especially in maintaining an attitude of presumptuous defiance towards God, compels them to enter on a new circle of the discussion with him. This is opened by Eliphaz in the new arraignment of Job before us. In respect of doctrinal contents this discourse exhibits little or nothing that is new, as indeed is the case generally with what the friends produce from this point on. It revolves, as well as that which Bildad and Zophar say in the sequel, altogether about the old thesis, that *Job's sufferings have a penal significance.* The speakers assume that to have been sufficiently demonstrated by what they have said before, and accordingly do not undertake to prove it further to him, but being themselves unqualifiedly right, they imagine that they have only to warn and threaten and upbraid him in a tone of the harshest reproof. The fact that Job had spoken excitedly, daringly, and inconsiderately against God, is, to their minds, transparent proof, which needs no further confirmation, of the correctness of their coarse syllogism: "All suffering is the penalty of sin; Job suffers severely; therefore, Job is a great sinner." And so assuming him to be impenitent, and hardened in presumption, they break out all the more violently against

him, with the purpose not of instructing him more thoroughly, but of more sharply blaming and chastising him. The consequence is that these later discourses of the friends become more and more meagre in their doctrinal and ethical contents, and abound more and more in controversial sharpness and polemic bitterness. They give evidence of a temper which has been aroused to more aggressive vehemence towards Job, aiming at his conversion as one laboring under a delusion, and, at the same time, of increasing monotonousness and unproductiveness in the development of their peculiar views, their fundamental dogma remaining substantially unchanged throughout.

2. Of these arraignments belonging to the second act (or stage) of the discussion, and having as just stated a polemic far more than a doctrinal significance, the preceding discourse by Eliphaz is the first, and, at the same time, the fullest in matter, and the most original. Its fundamental proposition (vers. 14, 15) is indeed nothing else than a repetition of that which the same speaker had previously propounded to Job as truth received by him through a divine revelation (chap. iv. 12 seq.). Here, however, by the parallel juxtaposition of "the heavens" with "the angels," there is introduced into the description an element which is, in part at least, new, and not uninteresting (comp. the exegetical remarks on ver. 15). The application of the thesis to Job's case is thereby made much more direct, wounding him much more sharply and relentlessly than before, as ver. 16 shows, where the harsh, "hideous" (Oetinger) description which El. gives of the corruption of the natural man, is unmistakably aimed at Job himself, as the genuine example of a hardened sinner. It will be seen from the extract from Seb. Schmidt in the homiletical remarks (see on ver. 2 seq.) how the harshness of the charges preferred against Job in the first division (especially in vers. 2–13) reaches the extreme point of merciless severity, and how, along with some censures which are certainly merited (as, *e.g.*, that he braves God, speaks proud words, despises mild words of comfort and admonition, *etc.*) there is much thrown in that is unjust and untrue, especially the charge that he "chose the speech of the crafty," and hence that he dealt in the deceitful subtleties and falsehoods of an advocate. The discourse, however, presents much that is better, that is objectively more true and valuable, and more creditable to the speaker. Here we must reckon the whole of the second division (vers. 20–35). Here we have a picture indisputably rich in poetic beauties, and in powerful and impressive passages, harmoniously complete in itself withal, and easily detached from its surroundings,—the picture of a wicked man, inwardly tormented by the pangs of an evil conscience, who after that he has for a long time enjoyed his apparent prosperity, at last succumbs to the combined power of the torments within, and of God's sentence without, and so comes to a horrible end. This passage—which reminds us of similar striking descriptions elsewhere of the foolish conduct of the ungodly and its merited retribution (as, *e.g.*, Ps. i.; xxxv.; lii.; Prov. i. 18 seq.; iv. 14 seq.; v. 1 seq.)—forms an interesting counterpart to the magnificent picture of the prosperity of the penitent and righteous man with which the first discourse of Eliphaz closes (chap. v. 17–27). The contrast between the two descriptions, which are related to each other like the serene, bright and laughing day and the gloomy night, is in many respects suggestive and noteworthy; but it is not to the speaker's advantage. In the former case, in painting that bright picture, he may be viewed as a prophet, unconsciously predicting that which was at last actually to come to pass according to God's decree. But here, in painting this gloomy night scene, which is purposely designed as a mirror by the contemplation of which Job might be alarmed, this tendency to prophesy evil shows him to be decidedly entangled in error. Indeed the point where this warning culminates, to wit, the charge of self-deception and of hypocritical lying, which having been first introduced in ver. 5 seq., is repeated in the criminating word—מִרְמָה—at the close (ver. 35), involves in itself gross injustice, and is an abortive attack which recoils on the accuser himself with destructive effect, besides depriving the whole description of its full moral value, and even detracting from its poetic beauty.

3. None the less, however, does the Sage of Teman, even when in error, remain a teacher of real wisdom, who has at his disposal genuine Chokmah material, however he may pervert its application in detail. This same gloomy picture with which the discourse before us closes, although it fails as to its special occasion and tendency, contains much that is worth pondering. It is brilliantly distinguished by rare truth of nature and conformity to experience in its descriptions, whether it treats of the inward torment and distress of conscience of the wicked (ver. 20 seq.), or of the cheerless and desperate issue of his life (ver. 29 seq.),—the latter description being particularly remarkable for the profound truth and the beauty of the figures introduced with such effective variety from the vegetable kingdom (see on ver. 33). But even in the first division there is not a little that is interesting and stimulating to profound reflection. This is especially true of ver. 7 seq., with its censure of Job's conceit of superiority on the ground of his wisdom—a passage the significance of which is attested both by the recurrence of one of its characteristic turns of expression (ver. 2) in the Solomonic Book of Proverbs, and of another in Jehovah's address to Job (chap. xxxviii. 3 seq.).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 2 seq.: SEB. SCHMIDT: He brings against Job the grave accusation of swelling up, as it were with the conceit of too great wisdom, and hence of sinning in more ways than one; thus he would convict him: (1) of vanity; (2) of causing scandal, and of encouraging men to neglect the fear of God—nay more, to fall into atheism; (3) of presumption, or of the conceit of too great wisdom; (4) of contempt for the word of God; (5) of proud anger against God. —WOHLFARTH: The reproaches which we bring against others are often only witnesses to our own guilt!

Ver. 7 seq.: Cocceius: He addresses Job here almost in the same terms as God in ch. xxxviii. but with another scope and purpose. Wisdom says in Prov. viii. 25, that it was begotten before the hills, *i. e.* that it is the eternal Son of God. This Wisdom alone was acquainted with all the mysteries of God the Father, to this Wisdom alone are owing the purification and justification of men, the full declaration of the gracious will of God, and the gift of the spirit of joy.

Vers. 14–16: Brentius: These words are most true: no one in himself is clean, pure and just; but in God, through faith in Christ, we come into possession of all cleanness, purity and justification (John xv. 3; Rom. xv. 1, *etc.*).—Mercier: Eliphaz finds fault with man's nature which nevertheless by faith is made pure.—Zeyss: Although the holy angels are pure and holy spirits, neither their holiness nor that of man is to be compared with the infinitely perfect holiness of God, but God only is and remains the Most Holy One; Is. vi. 3.—Oecolampadius (on ver. 16): Here is beautifully described the misery of man, who is abominable by reason of innate depravity. a child of wrath, corrupted and degenerated from his first estate, and so inflamed with lust, that as one in the dropsy drinks water, so does he drink sin, and is never satisfied.

Ver. 20 seq.: Idem: This is what he would say, that the wicked man, having an evil conscience within himself, at every time of his life when he becomes better known to himself, trembles, carries with him his own torments, and never hopes for good. Moses has finely illustrated this in Cain, Gen. iv.—Cramer: The ungodly and hypocrites live in continual restlessness of heart; but blessed are they whose sins are forgiven; they attain rest and peace of conscience.—Comp. Prov. xxvii. 1: "The wicked flee when no man pursueth, but the righteous are bold as a lion."

Ver. 29 seq.: Brentius: Eliphaz proceeds with his recital of the catalogue of curses on the wicked. . . . "His seed will burn up," *i. e.* the blessing of the wicked will be turned into a curse; and as the branches of trees are burned by fire, and scattered by the wind, which is called the Spirit [breath] of God, so do all the blessings of the wicked perish by the judgment of God, and the Spirit of His mouth.—Cramer: The dire punishments which befall the ungodly give courage to the pious, and strengthen their faith, when they see how the former are recompensed for their ungodliness (Ps. xci. 8). . . . Although the ungodly have many friends and many dependents, their name must nevertheless rot and perish (Prov. x. 7; Esth. vi. 13).—Zeyss (on vers. 31-33): As the sowing, so the reaping. He who sows vanity will also reap vanity; calamity and destruction will happen to him for a recompense (Hos. viii. 7; Gal. vi. 8). When the ungodly think that their life is at its very best, they are often enough quite suddenly taken away (Luke xii. 17).

B.—Job: Although oppressed by his disconsolate condition, he nevertheless wishes and hopes that God will demonstrate his innocence, against the unreasonable accusations of his friends.

Chapter XVI—XVII.

(A brief preliminary repudiation of the discourses of the friends as aimless and unprofitable):

Chap. XVI. 1–5.

1 Then Job answered and said:

2 I have heard many such things:
miserable comforters are ye all.
3 Shall vain words have an end?
or what emboldeneth thee that thou answerest?
4 I also could speak as ye do;
if your soul were in my soul's stead,
I could heap up words against you,
and shake mine head at you.
5 But I would strengthen you with my mouth,
and the moving of my lips should assuage your grief.

1. Lamentation on account of the disconsolateness of his condition, as forsaken and hated by God and men:

Vers. 6–17.

6 Though I speak, my grief is not assuaged;
and though I forbear, what am I eased?

7 But now He hath made me weary:
Thou hast made desolate all my company.
8 And Thou hast filled me with wrinkles, which is a witness against me;
and my leanness rising up in me
beareth witness to my face.
9 He teareth me in His wrath, who hateth me;
He gnasheth upon me with His teeth;
mine enemy sharpeneth his eyes upon me.
10 They have gaped upon me with their mouth;
they have smitten me upon the cheek reproachfully;
they have gathered themselves together against me.
11 God hath delivered me to the ungodly,
and turned me over into the hands of the wicked.

12 I was at ease, but He hath broken me asunder;
He hath also taken me by my neck, and shaken me to pieces,
and set me up for His mark.
13 His archers compass me round about,
He cleaveth my reins asunder, and doth not spare;
He poureth out my gall upon the ground.
14 He breaketh me with breach upon breach;
He runneth upon me like a giant.
15 I have sowed sackcloth upon my skin,
and defiled my horn in the dust.
16 My face is foul with weeping,
and on my eyelids is the shadow of death;
17 not for any injustice in mine hands;
also my prayer is pure.

2. Vivid expression of the hope of a future recognition of his innocence:

Chapter XVI. 18—XVII. 9.

18 O earth, cover not thou my blood!
and let my cry have no place!
19 Also now, behold, my witness is in heaven,
and my record is on high.
20 My friends scorn me:
but mine eye poureth out tears unto God.
21 O that one might plead for a man with God,
as a man pleadeth for his neighbor!
22 When a few years are come,
then I shall go the way whence I shall not return.

Chap. XVII. 1. My breath is corrupt,
my days are extinct,
the graves are ready for me.
2 Are there not mockers with me?
and doth not mine eye continue in their provocation?

3 Lay down now, put me in a surety with Thee;
who is he that will strike hands with me?
4 For Thou hast hid their heart from understanding?
therefore shalt Thou not exalt them.
5 He that speaketh flattery to his friends,
even the eyes of his children shall fail.
6 He hath made me also a byword of the people;
and aforetime I was as a tabret.
7 Mine eye also is dim by reason of sorrow,
and all my members are as a shadow.
8 Upright men shall be astonished at this,
and the innocent shall stir up himself against the hypocrite.

9 The righteous also shall hold on his way,
and he that hath clean hands shall be stronger and stronger.

3. Sharp censure of the admonitory speeches of the friends as unreasonable, and destitute of all power to comfort:

VERS. 10–16.

10 But as for you all, do ye return, and come now;
for I cannot find one wise man among you.
11 My days are passed,
my purposes are broken off,
even the thoughts of my heart.
12 They change the night into day:
the light is short because of darkness.
13 If I wait, the grave is mine house;
I have made my bed in the darkness.
14 I have said to corruption, Thou art my father;
to the worm, Thou art my mother and my sister.
15 And where is now my hope?
as for my hope, who shall see it?
16 They shall go down to the bars of the pit,
when our rest together is in the dust.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Heartlessly repulsed by his friends, and left without comfort, Job turns, more trustfully than in his previous apologies, to the God who evidenced Himself in his good conscience, of whom he cannot believe that He will leave him forever without testifying to his innocence, however cheerless a night of despair may in the meanwhile surround him. It is in the expression of his *confidence, and of his inward yearning and waiting for this Divine testimony to his innocence* (ch. xvi. 18 to xvii. 9) that the significance of this discourse culminates, so far as it gives pleasing evidence of progress beyond Job's former frame of mind. Along with this indeed it gives evidence that the spirit of hopeless and bitter complaint is, if not intensified, at least substantially unchanged and undiminished. The first *principal division* of the discourse (ch. xvi. 6-17) which precedes that expression of yearning confidence in God's help contains in particular an expression of cheerless lamentation over his condition, as one forsaken by God and men; while a shorter introduction prefaced to this division (ch. xvi. 2-5), as well as the concluding section, or third division (ch. xvii 10-16) are particularly occupied with a bitter complaint on account of the misunderstanding and heartless conduct of the friends.—The whole discourse comprises six long strophes, the first of which constitutes the introduction, extending through four verses, or ten stichs (ch. xvi. 2-5), while the first and second divisions contain each two strophes (of 6, 7 verses, or 14 stichs), the third division, however, only one strophe (of 7 verses, or 14 stichs).

2. *Exordium* of the discourse, or *introductory strophe:* A short preliminary repudiation of the discourses of the friends as aimless, and destitute of all power to comfort: ch xvi. 2-5.

Ver. 2. **I have heard** (already) **many such things** (רַבּוֹת, *multa*, as in ch. xxiii. 14), **and miserable comforters are ye all.** מְנַחֲמֵי עָמָל, lit. "comforters of distress" [Gen of attribute, Green, § 254, 6] are *burdensome* comforters (*consolatores onerosi*, Jer.), who, instead of comfort, minister only trouble and distress; comp. ch. xv. 11.

Ver. 3. **Are windy words** (now) **at an end?** Comp. ch. xv. 2, where Eliphaz reproaches Job with windy speech—a reproach which Job now pays back in the same coin.—**Or what vexes thee** [addressed more particularly to Eliphaz] **that thou answerest?** המריץ, Hiph. of מרץ, "to be sick, weak" (see on ch. vi. 25), signifies "to make sick, to afflict" (Ewald, Schlott., Dillm.), or again "to goad, incite, vex" (Del.) [see the examples in notes on vi. 25 favoring this definition]: not "to make sweet, to sweeten," as the Targ. interprets, as though מרץ were without further qualification =מלץ.—כִּי moreover is not=*quum* (Hirz.), but as in ch. vi. 11 *quod:* "what vexes thee *that* thou answerest," or "to answer."

Ver. 4. **I also indeed would speak like you,** *i. e.*, would be minded to serve you with such like discourses as your own [Dillmann, Conant, Renan, Rodwell, *etc.*, with good reason prefer to render the subjunctive אֲדַבֵּרָה "I could," or "might," rather than "would"].—**If your soul were instead of mine;** *i. e.* in case you had my place, your persons were instead of mine. [Conant, however: "*Your soul* is not to be taken as a periphrasis of the personal pronoun. *Soul*, the seat of intelligence, mental activity and emotion, stands as the representative of these faculties in man, and is specially appropriate here, where there is immediate reference to what is thought, felt and suffered. The force of the expression is lost therefore by substituting *ye* and *me*."]—**Would** [or could] **weave words against you.**—

הִחְבִּיר בְּמִלִּים is not "to make a league with words" (Gesen. [Rodwell], *etc.*), nor again: "to affect wisdom with words" (Ewald), but to "combine words, string them together like pearls." Instead of the simple accus. of the object מִלִּים, the more choice construction with בְּ instrum. is used; comp. the following member, also ver. 10; Jer. xviii. 16; Lam. i. 17 (Gesen. § 138 [§ 135] 1, Rem. 3). ["When he says: I would range together, *etc.*, he gives them to understand that their speeches are more artificial than natural, more declamations than the outgushings of the heart." Del.]—**And shake my head at you**; *viz.*, as a gesture of scorn and malicious pleasure; comp. Ps. xxii. 8 [7]; Is. xxxvii. 22; Jer. xviii. 16; Sir. xii. 18; Matt. xxvii. 39. It should be borne in mind that what is hateful in such conduct is not to be charged upon Job (who indeed only states what he *could* do if he had before him the friends, weak and miserable as he is now, and should then follow the promptings of the natural man), but on the friends, before whom Job here holds up as in a mirror the hatefulness of their own conduct. [In regard to the rendering of עַל by "against," and the explanation of הֵנִיעַ as a gesture of scorn, see below on ver. 5.]

Ver. 5. **Would** [could] **strengthen you with my mouth**: *i. e.* with mere words, instead of with deeds of a love that wins the heart. [On the form אֲאַמִּצְכֶם with Tsere shortened to Hhirik, see Green, § 104, *h.*]—**And the sympathy of my lips** (נִיד, commisseration, sympathy, only here; comp. the phrase, similar in sound, נִיב שְׂפָתַיִם, "fruit of the lips," Is. lvii. 19) **should assuage**, scil. your grief. חָשַׂךְ, "to soothe, restrain, check," here without an obj. as in Is. lviii. 1. The following verse easily enables us to supply כְּאֵב, as the object. [The E. V., Wem., Bar., Elz., *etc.*, render this as a contrast with ver. 4, as though Job, after there describing what he *might* do if they were in his place, describes here what, on the other hand, he really *would* do. But there is nothing to indicate such a contrast. Ver. 5 is most simply and naturally the continuation of ver. 4.—The irony of the passage is most keen and cutting. If you were in my place, says Job, if your soul were tried as mine is, I could speak windy words in abundance as you have done, I could string them out one after another, and nod my head to comfort: oh, yes! all such comfort—sympathy of the head, of the mouth, of the lips, I could lavish upon you—that is cheap enough, as your conduct shows—but as for the heart, that is quite another matter! It will be seen from this paraphrase of Job's language that a somewhat different view is taken of one or two expressions, particularly in ver. 4, from that given above by Zöckler. It seems unnecessary and unnatural to suppose that Job would in ver. 4 describe himself as framing words *against* them, and indulging in gestures of *malicious mockery*, and then in ver. 5 as *strengthening* and *soothing* them with words—but nothing more. Moreover the expressions of ver. 4 would thus lose their *point*, there being no reason to suppose that the friends had shown any such malignity as would be thus suggested. What Job says is, that he could multiply words of cold formal sympathy, that he could string out such words *upon* them, or *towards* them; and again that he could make with his head the customary oriental *gesture* of condolence (נוּעַ here like נוּד, see above, ch. ii. 11 and comp. Gesen. sub. v.), this being by implication all the sympathy he had received from them.—E.]

3. *First Division.* A lamentation concerning the cheerlessness of his condition, as one forsaken and persecuted by God and men. Vers. 6-17.

First Strophe: vers. 6-11. From the friends, the "miserable comforters," who leave him in his helplessness, he turns to himself, who is so greatly in need of sympathy, because God has delivered him over to the scorn and the cruelty of the unrighteous.

Ver. 6. ["He bethinks himself whether he will continue the colloquy further. Already in the lamentation of ch. iii. Job had given vent to his grief, and solicited comfort. The colloquy thus far had shown that from them he had no comfort to expect. Should he then speak further, in order to procure at least some alleviation of his grief? but he cannot anticipate even this as the result of his speaking. He must accordingly be silent; yet even then he is no better off." Dillm.]—**If I speak** (voluntative after אִם, see Ew. § 355, *b*) **my grief is not assuaged; if I forbear** (voluntative without אִם, as in ch. xi. 17; Ps. lxxiii. 16, *etc.*), **what departs from me**, *viz.* of my pain? how much of my pain goes away from me, do I lose? The unexpressed answer would naturally be: Nought! On יַהֲלֹךְ, comp. ch. xiv. 20.

Ver. 7. **Nevertheless—now He hath exhausted me**, *viz.* God, not the pain (כְּאֵבִי, ver. 6), which the Vulg., Aben-Ezra, *etc.*, regard as the subj. The particle אַךְ, which belongs to the whole sentence, signifies neither: "of a truth, yea verily!" (Ew.) nor "only" [=entirely], as though it belonged only to הֶלְאַנִי (Hirz., Hahn, *etc.*), but it has here an adversative meaning, and states, in opposition to the two previously mentioned possibilities of speaking and being silent, what is actually the case with Job; hence it should be rendered "still, nevertheless," *verum tamen:* [Renan: *Mais quoi!* "He is absolutely incapable of offering any resistance to his pain, and care has also been taken that no solacing word shall come to him from any quarter," Del. See the next clause].—**Thou hast desolated all my circle.** עֵדָה here not "rabble," as in ch. xv. 34, but *sensu bono*—circle of friends and family dependents (Carey: all my clan). ["This mention of the family is altogether in place, seeing that the loss of the same must be doubly felt by him now that his friends are hostile to him." Schlott.]. The Pesh. reads "all my testimony" (עֵדוּתִי), *i. e.*, all that witness in my behalf, all my prosperity (so also Hahn among the moderns), to which however הֲשִׁמּוֹתָ is not particularly suitable. Note moreover the transition, bearing witness as it does to the vivid excite-

ment of the speaker's feelings, from the declarations concerning God in the third person (which we find in the first member, and which appear again ver. 9 seq.), and the mournful plaintive address to Him here and in ver. 8, in which the description before us is directly continued.

Ver. 8. **And hast seized me** (not "Thou makest me wrinkled," Vulg., Luther [E. V., Lee, Rodwell] or "shrivelest me together," Del.—for קמט signifies "to press together, to fasten firmly together;" comp. ch. xxii. 16. [Wordsworth attempts somewhat peculiarly to combine the two definitions: "*Thou hast bound me fast with wrinkles*, as with a chain"].—**It is become a witness**, *viz.*, the fact that thou hast seized me; the circumstance that God makes him suffer so severely is—so at least it seems—a witness of his guilt. [This clause, taken in connection especially with the following parallelism, seems certainly to favor the rendering of the Vulg., E. V., *etc.* "thou hast filled me with wrinkles" The *witness* against Job is naturally something which like his "leanness" is visible. The corrugation of the skin was a feature of elephantiasis more marked even than the emaciation of the body, and would hardly be omitted in so vivid a description of his condition as Job here gives. The primary signification of "seizing," or "compressing" should not however be lost sight of; indeed it adds much to the terrible force of the representation to retain it, and, with Wordsworth, to combine the two definitions, only in a somewhat different way from his; the true conception being that God—who in ver. 12 is represented as seizing Job and dashing him in pieces, —is here represented as seizing, compressing him, until his body is shriveled, crumpled up into wrinkles.—E.]. In opposition to Ewald, who changes הָיָה into הַיָּה (= הַוָּה, see ch. vi. 2; xxx. 13), and translates accordingly: "and calamity seized me as a witness'—comp. Del. and Dillm. on the passage: [who object that it would leave לְעֵד without much of its force and emphasis, and that the construction would be too condensed and artificial].—**And my leanness has appeared against me, accusing me to the face** (speaking out against me, comp ch. xv. 6 *b*). On כַּחַשׁ = consumption, emaciation, comp. Ps. cix. 24. The signification rests on a metaphor similar to that by virtue of which a dried-up brook is called a "liar" (ch. vi. 15 seq.).

Ver. 9. **His anger has torn and made war upon me; He has gnashed against me with His teeth; as mine enemy He has whetted His eyes against me.** God, who is now again spoken of in the third person, is imagined as a ferocious beast of prey, who is enraged against Job. So above in ch. x. 16.—As to the "tearing," comp. Hos. vi. 1; the "making war," ch. xxx. 21; the "whetting" or "sharpening" of the eyes, Ps. vii. 13 [12]: also the *acies oculorum* of the Romans, and the modern expression, "to shoot a murderous look at any one"

Ver. 10. Men also, like God, fall upon Job, as his enemies, resembling beasts of prey.—**They have opened wide their mouth against me** (a gesture of insolent mockery, as in Ps. xxii. 8 [7]; Jer. lvii. 4); **with abuse** (*i. e.*, with abusive speech) **they strike me on the cheeks** (comp. Mic. iv. 14 [v. 1]; Lam. iii. 30; John xviii. 22; xix. 3); **together they strengthen themselves against me**, or again: they complete; fill themselves up [= fill up their ranks] against me, for הִתְמַלֵּא means "to gather themselves together to a מְלֹא (Isa. xxxi. 4), a heap;" not "to equip themselves with a full suit of armor," as Hirzel would explain, supplying בַּרְזֶל.—The whole of this lamentation, which reminds us of Ps. xxii., is general in its form; it contemplates nevertheless the hostile attacks made by the friends on Job, as in particular the word "together" in the third member shows—in hearing which the friends could not help feeling that they were personally aimed at in the strong expressions of the speaker, even as he on his part must have had his sensibilities hurt by such expressions as those of Eliphaz in ch. xv. 16 (see on the passage).

Ver. 11. **God delivers me** (comp. Deut. xxiii. 16 [15]) **to the unrighteous, and casts me headlong into the hand of the wicked.** יִרְטֵנִי, Imperf. Kal. of ירט (contracted from יִירְטֵנִי, Ges., §70 [§68], Rem. 3). ["The preformative *Jod* has *Metheg* in correct texts, so that we need not suppose, with Ralbag, a רטה similar in meaning to ירט." Del]. *præcipitem me dat;* comp. LXX. ἔῤῥιψε and Symmachus ἐνέβαλε.—עֲוִיל in the first member, "the perverted one, the reprobate, the unrighteous," or again—"the boy" [*der Bube*, "or the boyish, childish, knavish one"] as Del. explains it, (referring to ch. xix. 18; xxii. 11), is used collectively for the plur., as the parallel term רְשָׁעִים in *b* shows.

Second Strophe: Vers. 12–17. Continuation of the description of the cruel and hostile treatment he had received from God, notwithstanding his innocence.

Ver. 12. **I was at ease, and He then shattered me.** שָׁלֵו, secure, unharmed, suspecting no evil; comp. ch. xxi. 23; iii. 26.—פַּרְפַּר, Pilp. of פרר with strong intensive signification—"to shatter, to crush in pieces;" so also the following פִּצְפֵּץ, from פצץ, "to beat in pieces, to dash to pieces." ["He compares himself to a man who is seized by the hair of his head, and thrown down a precipice, where his limbs are broken. He probably alludes to some ancient mode of punishing criminals." Wemyss]. Observe the onomatopoetic element of these intensive forms, which furthermore are to be understood not literally or physically, but in a figurative sense of the sudden shattering of prosperity, and peace of soul.—**And set me for a mark.** מַטָּרָה (from נָטַר, τηρεῖν, like σκοπός from σκέπτεσθαι), target, mark, as in 1 Sam. xx. 20; Lam. iii. 12; comp. מִפְגָּע above in ch. vii. 20.

Ver. 13 expands the figure in ch. xii. *c.*—**His arrows whirred about me.** רַבָּיו, not "his troops, his archers" (Rabb. [E. V., Noy., Con.,

Car., Rod., Elz., *etc.*]), but according to the unanimous witness of the ancient versions: "his arrows, darts" (from רבב = רבה, רמה, *jacere*. Gen. xlix. 23; comp. Gen. xxi. 10).—(**He cleaves my reins without sparing, pours out on the earth my gall** (comp. Lam. ii. 11). Job here describes more specifically the terrible effect of God's arrows, *i. e.*, of the ailments inflicted on him by a hostile God (comp. ch. vi. 4, also the well-known mythological representations of classical antiquity), representing in accordance with the Hebrew conception the noblest and most sensitive of the inner organs of the body as affected, namely the reins, and also the gall-bladder. In view of the highly poetic character of the description, it is not necessary to inquire whether he conceives of the "outpouring" of the gall as taking place inwardly, without being at all perceptible externally, or whether, with a disregard of physiological possibility or probability, he represents it as something that is externally visible. It is moreover worthy of note that according to Arabic notions the "rupture of the gall-bladder" may really be produced by violent painful emotions. Comp. Delitzsch on the passage; also his *Biblical Psychology* [p. 317, Clark]; also my *Theol. Naturalis*, p. 618.

Ver. 14. **He breaks through me breach upon breach.** פֶּרֶץ, comp. ch. xxx. 14, here as accus. of the object, united to its cognate verb; comp. Gesen., § 138 [§ 135] Rem. 1.—**He runs upon me like a mighty warrior.** In this new turn of the comparison Job, and in particular his body, appears as a wall, or a fortress, which is by degrees breached by missiles and battering-rams, and which God himself assaults by storm.

Ver. 15. **I have sewed sackcloth upon my skin,** *i. e.* I have girded around myself, and stitched together (about the loins) a closely fitting mourning garment of close hair (comp. שַׂק in Isa. iii. 24; xx. 2; xxxii. 11; 1 Kings xxi. 27; 2 Kings vi. 30, *etc.*). The "sewing upon the skin" is doubtless to be understood only figuratively of the laying on of a closely fitting garment, which it is not intended to lay off immediately. Possibly, indeed, there may be an allusion to the cracked swollen skin of one diseased with elephantiasis, in which the hair of the sackcloth (*cilicium*) must of necessity stick (see my *Kritische Gesch. der Ascese*, p. 82 seq.). [See also Art. "Sackcloth" in SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.* "Job does not say of it that he put it on, or slung it around him, but that he sewed it upon his naked body; and this is to be attributed to the hideous distortion of the body by elephantiasis, which will not admit of the use of the ordinary form of clothes." Delitzsch]. In any case in referring to this stiff, almost dead skin, as a part of his fearfully distorted body, he chooses the term גֶּלֶד, which appears in Hebrew only here (though more common in Aram. and Arab.), and in contrast with עוֹר, the "sound, healthy skin," may be translated "hide;" comp. the *βύρσα* of the LXX.—**And have lowered** (lit. "stuck," see below) **my horn**—the symbol of power and of free manly dignity, comp. 1 Sam. ii. 1, 10; Ps. lxxxix. 18 [17], 25 [24]; xcii. 11 [10]; *etc.*, Luke i. 69—**into the dust**:—this being a sign of his humiliation, of his consciousness of the defeat, and of the deep sorrow which he has been called to endure. For this lowering of the horn into the dust of the earth is the direct opposite of "lifting up the horn" (Ps. lxxxiii. 3 [2] as a symbol of the increase of power and dignity. עוֹלֵל is with Saad., Rosenm., Ew., Hirz., Dillm., *etc.*, to be derived from עלל, *introire*, of frequent use in the Aram. and Arab., and thus signifies "to stick into, to dig into." If it were the Pil. of עלל, "to act," meaning accordingly "to abuse," or "to defile" (Targ., Pesch., Delitzsch [E. V., Schlott.] *etc.*), the לְ before the object would not be wanting; comp. Lam. i. 22; ii. 20; iii. 51. To be preferred to this is the translation—"I roll my horn in the dust" (Umbr., Vaihing., Hahn), a rendering which is etymologically admissible.

Ver. 16 **My face is burning red with weeping.** חֳמַרְמְרָה (instead of which we ought perhaps with the K'ri to read the plural חֳמַרְמְרוּ, unless we explain the fem., like תִּשְׁטֹף in ch xiv. 19, in accordance with Gesen., § 146, [§ 143], 3), Pualal of חמר, an intensive passive form, expressing the idea of being exceedingly reddened, glowing red (comp. Lam. i. 20; ii. 11). [From the same root comes the name Alhambra, applied to the building from its color. See Delitzsch].—**And on mine eyelashes is a death-shade,** *i. e.*, by reason of continuous weeping, and the weakening thereby of the power of sight, my eyes are encompassed by a gloom of night: [an explanation which Schlottmann characterizes as flat and prosaic. The idea is rather that in Job's despondent mood he conceived of "the shadow of death" as gathering around. He had well-nigh wept himself out of life].

Ver. 17. **Although no violence is in my hands** (or clings to them) **and my prayer is pure.**—Job emphasizes his innocence here in contrast not only with ver. 16, but with the whole description thus far given of the persecution which he had endured, vers. 12-16.—עַל is used here, as in Is. liii. 9, as a conjunction, in the sense of "notwithstanding that, although," (Ewald, § 222, *b*), not as a preposition, as Hirzel explains it ("in spite of non-violence").

4. *Second Division.* A vivid expression of the hope of a future recognition of his innocence: ch. xvi. 18—xvii. 9.

First Strophe: Ver. 18—ch. xvii. 2. [His confidence in God as his witness and vindicator—his only hope in view of the speedy approach of death].

Ver. 18. **Earth, cover not thou my blood,** *i. e.*, drink it not up, let it lie open to view, and cry to heaven as a witness to my innocence, Comp. Gen. iv. 10; Ezek. xxiv. 7 seq.; Is. xxvi. 21. ["As according to the tradition it is said to have been impossible to remove the stain of the blood of Zachariah, who was murdered in the court of the temple, until it was removed by

the destruction of the temple itself." Delitzsch. "According to the old belief no rain or dew would moisten the spot marked by the blood of a person murdered when innocent, or change its blighted appearance into living green." Ewald]. The second member also expresses essentially the same meaning: **and let my cry have no resting-place**, *i. e.*, let not the cry for vengeance arising from my shed blood (or the cry of my soul poured out in my blood, Gen. ix. 4, *etc.*), be stilled, let it not reach a place of rest, before it appears as my גֹּאֵל (ch. xix. 25) to deliver and avenge me. ["Therefore in the very God who appears to him to be a bloodthirsty enemy in pursuit of him, Job nevertheless hopes to find a witness of his innocence: He will acknowledge his blood, like that of Abel, to be the blood of an innocent man. It is an inward irresistible demand made by his faith which here brings together two opposite principles—principles which the understanding cannot unite—with bewildering boldness. Job believes that God will even finally avenge the blood which His wrath has shed, as blood that has been innocently shed." Delitzsch].

Ver. 19. **Even now behold in heaven my witness, and my attestor** (שָׂהֵד, LXX. *συνίστωρ*. an Aram. synonym of עֵד, witness, comp. Gen. xxxi. 47) **in the heights.**—In regard to מְרוֹמִים as a synonym. of שָׁמַיִם, comp. ch. xxv. 2; xxxi. 2. גַּם עַתָּה. "even now," (not "now however," Ewald) sets the present condition of Job, apparently quite forsaken, but in reality still supported and upheld by God as a heavenly witness of his innocence, in contrast with a future period, when he will be again publicly acknowledged and brought to honor. This more prosperous and happy future he does not yet indeed realize so vividly as later in ch. xix. 25 seq. That of which he speaks here is only the contrast between his apparent forsakenness, and the fact that, as he firmly believes, God in heaven is still on his side. ["If his blood is to be one day avenged, and his innocence recognized, he must have a witness of the same. And reflecting upon it he remembers that even now, when appearances are all against him, he has such a witness in God in heaven." Dillm.].

Ver. 20. ["The conduct of the friends in denying, nay in mocking his innocence, compels him to cling to this God in heaven." Dillm.].—**They who mock me** (lit., "my mockers," with strong accent on "mockers") **are my friends.** ["It is worthy of remark that the word here used, *melits*, signifies also an *interpreter*, an *intercessor*, and is employed in that sense; below, ch. xxxiii. 23; comp. Gen. xlii. 23; 2 Chron. xxxii. 31; Is. xliii. 27; and some, as *Professors Lee* and *Carey*, have assigned that sense to the word here, 'My true interpreters are my friends;' and they suppose in this word, here and in xxxiii. 23, a prophetic reference to the Mediator. But the Auth. Ver. appears to be correct; and the similarity of the words serves to bring out the contrast between the unkindness of man, and the mercy of God." Words.].—**To Eloah mine eye poureth tears**: *i. e.*, although my friends mock me, instead of taking me under their protection, and attesting my innocence, I still direct to God a look of tearful entreaty that He would do justice, *etc.*—["An equally strong emphasis lies here on subj. and predicate: 'My friends' stands in contrast with God; 'my mockers' in contrast with 'my witness,' ver. 19; and finally also 'my mockers' in contrast with 'my friends.'" Schlottm.]. Ew., Dillm., *etc.*, take the first member, less suitably, as assigning the reason for the second: "*because* my friends are become such as mock me, mine eye pours out tears to Eloah," *etc.*

Ver. 21 states the object of the weeping (*i. e.*, the yearning) look which he lifts up to God. This object is twofold: (1) **That He would do justice to a man before God**: lit. "that He would decide (וְיוֹכַח, voluntative expressing the final end, as in ch. ix. 33) for the man *against* Eloah, or *with* Eloah (עִם as in Ps. lv. 19 [18]; xciv. 16 [15] of an opponent); *i. e.*, that before His own bar He would pronounce me not guilty, that He would cease to misunderstand and to persecute me as an enemy, but would rather assist me to my right, and so appear on my side. (2) (That He would do justice) **to the son of man against his friend**, that He would justify me against my human friend (רֵעֵהוּ distributively for רֵעָיו), and set me forth as innocent—which would result immediately upon his justification before God's bar. For the interchange of "man" and "son of man" in poetic parallelism, comp. Ps. viii. 5. It is not necessary to adopt Ewald's suggestion (*Jahrb. der bibl. Wissenschaft*, IX. 38) to read בֵּין אָדָם, instead of בֶּן־אָ, in order to acquire a more suitable construction for הוֹכִיחַ. The construction according to the common reading presents nothing that is objectionable, scarcely anything that is particularly harsh. The influence of the לְ of the first member extends forward to בֶּן־אָדָם (as in ch. xv. 3), and the לְ before רֵעֵהוּ = "in respect to, against," supplies the place of the עִם of the first member. It would be much harsher were we, with Schlottmann, Ewald (in Comm.), and Olsh. to translate the second member: "and judges man against his friend," a rendering which is condemned by the usage of the language, for הוֹכִיחַ with accus. of person never signifies "to judge," but always "to punish, reprove." ["Job appeals from God to God: he hopes that truth and love will finally decide against wrath. . . . Schlottmann aptly recalls the saying of the philosophers, which applies here in a different sense from that in which it is meant: *Nemo contra Deum, nisi Deus ipse.*" Del. "The prayer of Job is fulfilled in ch. xlii. 7; and that too in a sense quite otherwise than that which Job had ventured to hope for, even in this life. This is again one of the passages where the poet permits his hero, in an exalted moment, to enjoy a presage of the issue." Dillm.] Concerning the theological significance of the wish here expressed by Job, that he might be justified by God before God as well as before men; comp. the Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks.

Ver. 22. Giving the reason why Job longs to

be vindicated, arising from the fact that his end is near, and that for him who has once died there is no prospect of a return to this life. [This, however, is not to be understood as a reason given why God should interpose speedily to vindicate him *before* his death. Rather the argument is drawn from the hopelessness of his physical condition. Death was sure and near; that recovery which the friends promised on condition of repentance was out of the question: hence if he is to be vindicated, it must be by God, who can do it when he is gone.]—**For years that may be numbered are coming on, and by a path without return shall I go hence.**—The thought is substantially the same as in ch. vii. 7-10; and x. 20 seq.—שְׁנוֹת מִסְפָּר, lit. "years of number" (Gen. xxxiv. 30; Ps. cv. 12), are years that may be numbered, *i. e.* a few years (LXX: *ἔτη ἀριθμητά*), by which we are naturally to understand those which still remain before his death, the remaining years of his life (not all the years of his life, as Hahn and Del. explain). For יֶאֱתָיוּ (in regard to the form, comp. on ch. xii. 6) can only mean: "they are coming on, they stand before me," not: "they are passing away" (*transeunt*, Vulg., *etc.*), nor: "their end is coming on" (Hahn, Del.). That Job here announces the sad issue in which the rapid and inevitably fatal course of the elephantiasis generally resulted, is shown by the conclusion of the discourse, ch. xvii. 11-16.

Ch. xvii. 1 [the chapter-division here being manifestly errroneous] continues the statement of the reason given in ch. xvi. 22. It consists of abrupt sob-like ejaculations of which it may be truly said with Oetinger that they form "the requiem, which Job chants for himself even while yet living."—**My spirit is disturbed**, so correctly most moderns, taking רוּחִי in the sense of "the spirit or power." The translation: "my *breath* is corrupt," or "destroyed" (De Wette, Del. [E. V., Rod., Elz., Con., Ber.], *etc.*), is less suitable here to the connection, which requires, as the subject of Job's expression, not that single symptom of a short and fetid breath [which would be a much less conclusive indication that his days were numbered than others which he might have mentioned], referred to also in ch. vii. 15; xix. 17; but requires rather some sign of the incipient dissolution of the whole psychical bodily organism, a failure of the vital principle.—**My days are extinct** (דעך=זעך, ch. vi. 17, which some MSS. exhibit here also); **graves await me** [Rodney: for me the tombs!]. Comp. the Arabic proverb: "to be a grave-companion (Ssâchib el-kubûr);" also the familiar saying of Luther: "to walk on the grave;" and the modern expression: "to stand with one foot in the grave."

Ver. 2. **Verily mockery surrounds me; and on their quarreling mine eye must dwell.**—So substantially Welte, Arnh., Del., Dillm. [Schlott., Con., Words.], whose rendering of this difficult verse is the most satisfactory; for (1) It is best to take אִם־לֹא, as in ch. i. 11; xxii. 20; xxxi. 36, *etc.*, as a formula of asseveration="verily, truly." (2) הֲתֻלִים (or according to another reading הֲתֻּלִים is an abstract term, formed from הָתַל=mockery, scoffing (not "deception," as Hirzel renders it); to render it as a concrete term in the sense of "mockers" [E. V., Noyes, *etc.*], or "beguiled," is at variance with the laws governing the formation of Hebrew words (see Ew. § 153, *a*; 179, *a*, *b*).—(3) הַמְּרוֹתָם is Inf. Hiph. with suffix, from מרה, which means in Hiph. "to make refractory," to incite to strife, to contend with one. The word is written with *Dagh. dirimens* in מ, comp. ix. 18; Joel i. 17, *etc.*—(4) תָּלַן, Jussive or Voluntative form of לִין, to lodge, to tarry (comp. ch. xix. 4; xxix. 19; xxxi. 32), is a pausal form for תָּלֵן, which occurs also in Judg. xix. 20, the use of which in a non-pausal position seems to be purely arbitrary, or rests possibly on euphonic grounds (the liquids *l* and *n* in juxtaposition being treated as though they were gutturals: comp. Ewald, § 141, *b*, Rem. 2). (5) The sense of the entire verse, according to the construction here given, is decidedly more suitable to the context: Of a truth it is mocking me (ה׳ עִמָּדִי, lit. "mockery is *with me, befalls me*") to force me, who am standing on the verge of the grave to confess a guilt from which I know myself to be free; and such hateful quarrelsome conduct it is that I must have continually before my eyes!—Other renderings are *e. g.* —*a.* That of the Pesh., Vulg., and recently of Hirzel, which takes הֲתֻלִים in the sense of "deception, illusion." Thus Hirzel's rendering is: "If deception is not with me, then let them continually henceforth quarrel." *b.* That of Rosenmüller: *annon illusiones mecum, et in adversando eorum pernoctat oculus meus.*—*c.* That of Ewald (in part also of Eichhorn, Umbr.): "If only I were not mocked and mine eye were not obliged to dwell," *etc.*—*d.* The rendering in part similar to the latter, of Vaih. and Heiligst.—"Oh, that mockery did not surround me! then could mine eye abide in peace with their contention!" —*e.* That of Stickel and Hahn: "Or are there not around me those who are deluded? must not mine eye dwell on their contention?"—[*f.* That of Renan: "May it please God that traitors might be far from me, and that mine eye be never more afflicted with their quarrels!"]

Second Strophe: vers. 3-9. Repetition of the yearning and trustful supplication to God as the only remaining attestor or witness of his innocence now remaining to him in view of the heartless coldness, nay the hostility of his human friends.—**Oh, lay down [now], be Thou bondsman for me with Thyself! who else will furnish surety to me?** The thought is not substantially different from that in ch. xvi. 21, only that the representation which there predominates of an adjudication in favor of Job's innocence is here replaced by that of *pledging* or *binding one's self as security* for it. For all the expressions of the verse are borrowed from the system of pledging. With the Imper. שִׂימָה is to be supplied, as the fol-

lowing עֲרְבֵנִי shows, an accus. of the object, "a pledge, security." It is not necessary with Reiske and Olsh. to change עֲרְבֵנִי to עֲרָבֹנִי, *arrhabonem meam.* The following עִמָּךְ, indicating the person with whom the pledge is deposited, again represents God, precisely as in ch. xvi. 21, as being, so to speak, divided, or separated into two persons. The word of entreaty עֲרֹב (which appears also in Is. xxxviii. 14, and Ps. cxix. 122, and which is here used with the accus. of the person following in the sense of "representing any one mediatorially as ἔγγυος or μεσίτης) is replaced in the second member by the circumstantial phrase נִתְקַע לְיָד, to give surety by striking hands. For this is the meaning of the phrase, which elsewhere reads תָּקַע יָד, or כַּף (Prov. vi. 1; xvii. 18; xxii. 26), or simply תָּקַע (Prov. xi. 15). Here, however, where, instead of the person, the *hand* of the person is mentioned (לְיָדִי, instead of the simple לִי, which, according to Prov. vi. 1, we might be led to expect), the reflexive Niphal is used; hence literally: "who will strike himself [*scil.* his hand] into my hand;" *i. e.* who will (by a solemn striking of hands, as in a pledge) bind himself to me to vindicate publicly my innocence? What man will do this if Thou, God, doest it not?

Ver. 4 assigns a reason for this prayer for God's intervention as his security in the shortsightedness and narrow-mindedness of the friends: **for Thou hast closed** [lit. hid] **their heart to** [lit. from] **understanding** (to [from] a correct knowledge in respect to my innocence), **therefore Thou wilt not let them prevail:** lit. wilt not exalt them, *i. e.* above me, who am unjustly injured by them, but wilt rather at last confound them by demonstrating my innocence (as actually came to pass, ch. xlii. 7). תְּרֹמֵם, Imperf. Pil. of רוּם with plur. suffix, is a contraction of תְּרוֹמְמֵם, with omission of Dagh. forte in מ on account of the preceding long ô. The correction תָּרִמֵם (suggested by Dillm. with a reference to ch. xxxi. 15; xli. 2 K'ri) is unnecessary, as also the explanation of תְּרוֹמֵם as a Hithpael noun, signifying "striving upward, improvement, victory" (Ew.).

Ver. 5 continues the consideration of the unfriendly conduct of the friends. **Friends are delivered for a spoil, while the eyes of their** (lit. "of his") **children languish.**—חֵלֶק, "a share of booty, spoil" (according to Num. xxxi. 36) denotes here in particular, as the word יַגִּיד makes probable, mortgaged property, an article in pledge, distrained from a debtor by a judicial execution; הִגִּיד לְחֵלֶק (for הִ׳ לִהְיוֹת חֵלֶק, comp. 1 Kings xiv. 2; Jer. xiii. 21) signifies to advertise and offer for sale such a pledged article in court; or, more simply and briefly, to distrain, to seize upon by means of a judicial execution. The subject of יַגִּיד is indefinite ["one exposes friends," *i. e.*, "friends are exposed"] (comp. chap. vi. 20). In the object רֵעִים Job certainly points immediately to himself, for certainly he only was the victim of the heartless conduct of the three. He purposely, however, expresses himself by a general proposition; for his whole description is as yet only ideal, imaginative. In the second member, as the sing. suffix in בָּנָיו shows, he again speaks only of himself as the one who was ill-treated, continuing the description (by means of an enallage of number, similar to that in chap. xviii. 5; xxiv. 5, 16; xxvii. 23), as though he had in *a* written רֵעַ or רֵעֵהוּ. Hence literally: "and the eyes of his children languish," or "although the eyes of his children languish" (Ewald, Stickel, Heiligst., Hahn, Dillmann, *etc.*). Many of the ancients, and also De Wette, Delitzsch [Noyes, Con., Renan, Barnes, Wem., Car., Wordsw., Rod.], *etc.*, translate: "Whoso spoileth friends, the eyes of his children must fail" (or, optatively, "may the eyes of his children fail!" So Rosenmüller, Vaihinger). [The E. V. adopts the same view of the general construction, but less appropriately takes חֵלֶק in the sense of "flattery:" "He that speaketh flattery to his friends, even the eyes of his children shall fail."] In this way, doubtless, the harshness of that change of number is avoided; but so to predict (or even to wish for) the punishment of the evil-doer seems here too little suited to the context, and especially does not agree with the contents of the following verse. [But it certainly agrees very well with the last member of the preceding verse, the thought of which it both confirms and expands. God would not, could not, favor the friends, for they had betrayed friendship, and thus had incurred judgment in which their posterity would share. Ver. 5 may be, as conjectured by some, a proverbial saying quoted by Job to emphasize ver. 4 *b*. The "pining of the eyes" is a frequent figure for suffering. This last construction has in its favor, therefore: (1) That it *is* suitable to the connection. (2) That it avoids the harshness of the other construction, with its sudden change of number and its strained introduction of the reference to the betrayed one's children, which is particularly pointless when applied to the childless Job. (3) It takes away from ver. 4 the isolation which belongs to it, according to the other construction, and provides a much simpler transition from ver 4 to ver. 5.—E.]

Ver. 6 *seq.* Continued description of the unfriendly conduct of the friends, only that the same is now directly charged on God. **And He** (*viz.*, God, who is manifestly to be understood here as the subject of the verb) **has set me for a proverb to the world.**—מְשֹׁל, a substant. infinitive (comp. chap. xii. 4), means a proverb, simile, *sensu objectivo*, hence an object of ridicule [or, as in E. V., "by-word"]. עַמִּים, lit. "nations," denotes here not the races living around Job (*e. g.*, those "gipsy-like troglodytes" who are more fully described in chap. xxiv. 30, and who, Delitzsch thinks, may possibly be intended here), but the common people generally (*vulgus, plebs*), hence equivalent to the great multitude, the world; comp. Prov. xxiv. 24.

And I must be one to be spit upon in the face.—תֹּפֶת (only here in the O. T.) denotes spittle, an object spit upon; לְפָנִים is in the closest union with it (comp. Num. xii. 14; Deut. xxv. 9). A תֹּפֶת לְפָ׳ is accordingly one into whose face any body spits, the object of the most unqualified public detestation. Comp. ch. xxx. 9 seq., from which passage it also appears that Job speaks here not only of that which his friends did to him, but that he uses עַמִּים in a more comprehensive sense.

Ver. 7. **Then mine eye became dim with grief** (כַּעַשׂ, as in chap. vi. 2; and comp. chap. xvi. 16; Ps vi. 8 [7]; xxxi. 10 [9]). **and all my members** (lit. "my frames, bodily frames, or structures") **are as shadows** [better on account of the generic הַ, "as a shadow"], *i. e.*, so meagre and emaciated, like intangible shadows, or phantoms; comp. chap. xix. 20.

Ver. 8. **The upright are astonished at this**—because they cannot understand how things can come to such a pass with one of their sort. **And the innocent is roused against the ungodly**—lit. "stirred up" by anger—in an opposite sense to that of chap. xxxi. 29, describing "the innocent man's sense of justice as being aroused on account of the prosperity of the חָנֵף, comp. Ps. xxxvii. 1; lxxiii." HIRZEL.

Ver. 8. **Nevertheless the righteous holds fast on his way** (the way of piety and rectitude in which he has hitherto walked), **and he that is of clean hands** (lit. "and the clean-of-hands," וּטְהָר־, as in Prov. xxii. 11) **increaseth in strength** (יֹסִיף, of inward increase, or growth of strength, as in Eccles. i. 18).—The whole verse is of great significance as an expression of the cheerful confidence in his innocence and deliverance which Job reaches after the bitter reflections of ver. 5 seq. So far from realizing the reproach of Eliphaz in chap. xv. 4, that he would "destroy piety and diminish devotion before God," he holds fast on his godly way, yea, travels it still more joyously and vigorously than before (comp. Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks). ["These words of Job (if we may be allowed the figure) are like a rocket, which shoots above the tragic darkness of the book, lighting it up suddenly, although only for a short time." DEL.]

5. *Third Division: Sixth Strophe.* Severe censure of the admonitions of the friends, as devoid of understanding, and without any power to comfort, vers. 10–16.

Ver. 10. **But as for ye all** (כֻּלְּכֶם for כֻּלָּם as in 1 Kings xxii. 28, and Mic. i. 2 [corresponding more to the form of a vocative clause—Del.]; the preceding וְאוּלָם is here written וְאֻלָּם, with sharpened tone, for the sake of assonance)—**come on again, I pray.**—תָּשֻׁבוּ, instead of the Imper. שׁוּבוּ, which we might have expected, but which cannot stand so well at the beginning of the clause (comp. Ew., § 229) [besides that, as Delitzsch remarks, the first verb is used adverbially, *iterum, denuo*, according to GESEN., § 142 (§ 139), 3 *a*—and not either of a physical return, as though, irritated by his words, they had made a movement to depart (Renan), or of a mental return from their hostility (see vi. 29).—E.]. In this sense it is followed by the supplementary verb בֹּאוּ in the Imperf., connected with it by וְ. **I shall nevertheless not find a wise man among you**—*i. e.*, your heart remains closed against a right understanding of my condition (see ver. 4), however often and persistently you may attempt to justify your attacks upon me. ["He means that they deceive themselves concerning the actual state of the case before them; for in reality he is meeting death without being deceived, or allowing himself to be deceived, about the matter." DEL.]

Ver. 11 seq. prove this charge of a defective understanding on the part of the friends by setting forth the nearness of Job's end, and the almost complete exhaustion of his strength: this fact is fatal to their preconceived opinion as to the possibility of a joyful restoration of his prosperity, such as they had frequently set forth as depending on his sincere repentance. **My days are gone** (being quite near their end—comp. chap. xvi. 22), **my plans are broken off** (זִמּוֹת, lit. "connections, combinations," from זמם, "to bind together," the same as מְזִמּוֹת elsewhere, chap. xxi. 27; xlii. 2;—but not *sensu malo*, but in the good sense of the plans of his life which had been destroyed), **the nurslings** [*Pfleglinge*] **of my heart.**—מוֹרָשֵׁי are things which are coveted and earnestly sought after, favorite projects, plans affectionately cherished; comp. אָרַשׁ, to long after, Ps. xxi. 3 [from which root Dillmann suggests the present noun may be derived (מוֹרָשׁ for מְאֹרָשׁ, like מוֹסָר for מְאֹסָר from אסר), which would give at once the meaning, "desires, coveted treasures." So apparently Zöckler. If, according to the prevailing view, it be taken from ירשׁ, the meaning will be *peculia*, cherished possessions.—E.] Not so suitable is the definition "possessions" (from ירשׁ, *possidere*, after Obad. ver. 17 and Isa. xiv. 23), while the rendering ἄρθρα (LXX.), cords or bands [or, as Del. suggests, "joints, instead of valves of the heart"] (Gekat., Ewald) is entirely unsupported, and decidedly opposed to the laws of the language.

Ver. 12. **They change night into day** (comp. Isa. v. 20), inasmuch, to wit, as they picture before me joyous anticipations of life (thus Eliphaz in chap. v. 17 seq.; Bildad in chap. viii. 20 seq.; Zophar in chap. xi. 13 seq.), while notwithstanding I have before me only the dark night of death. **Light is to be near** (lit. "is near," *i. e.*, according to their assertions) **in the presence of darkness**, *i. e.*, there where the darkness is still present, or *in conspectu;* מִפְּנֵי, here therefore=*coram*, comp. chap. xxiii. 17 (so Umbreit, Vaih., Del.). Others (Ew., Hirz., Stick., Dillm.) take מִפְּנֵי in the comparative sense: light is nearer than the face of darkness, *i. e.*, than the visible darkness, which, however, is less suitable in the parallelism. The same is true of the explanation of Welte—"and they bring the light near to the darkness;" of Rosenmüller—"light

is near the darkness," and similarly the LXX.; of Schlottmann—"light, to which the darkness already draws near;" of Renan—"Ah! but your light resembles the darkness!" *etc.*—Note still further that here in vers. 11–12, where the tone of lamentation is resumed, those short, sob-like ejaculations appear again, which we have already met with above in vers. 1–2. [The explanation here given does not seem to harmonize perfectly with the context. With ver. 10 Job seems to dismiss the friends from his present discourse. He flings that verse at them as a parting contemptuous challenge, and so takes his leave of them. With ver. 11 he enters on the pathetic elegiac strain with which he closes each one of his discourses thus far (see chap. vii. 22; x. 20 seq.; xiv. 18 seq.). Vers. 11, 12 are characterized, as Zöckler justly remarks, by "brief, sob-like ejaculations" (as in vers. 1, 2), which are more befitting the elegy of a crushed heart than the sarcasm of a bitter spirit. Job makes himself the theme of the whole passage from ver. 11 to ver. 16. He is pre-occupied exclusively with his own lamentable condition and prospects, not with the course of his friends, any reference to which after ver. 10 would interrupt the self-absorption of his sorrow. Supposing Job then to be occupied with himself solely, it follows that יָשִׂימוּ is to be taken impersonally, and the verse may be explained either—*a.* With Noyes: "*Night hath become day to me* (*i. e.* I have sleepless nights; I am as much awake by night as by day), *the light bordereth on darkness* (*i. e.* the day seems very short; the daylight seems to go as soon as it is come)." Or *b.* We may translate: "*Night will* (soon) *take the place of day, light* (in which I am tarrying for a brief season, awaiting my abode in Sheol, ver. 13) *is not far from darkness* (קָרוֹב מִפְּנֵי, *prope abest ab;* LXX. φῶς ἐγγὺ ἀπὸ προσώπου σκότους=οὐμακρὰν σκ'., according to Olympiodorus.—The use of פְּנֵי with מִן, which Delitzsch objects to this rendering, is finely poetic. The darkness *faces* him, stares upon him, close at hand, just on the other side of this narrow term of light which is left to him). In favor of *b* may be urged: (1) The use of the fut. יָשִׂימוּ. following the preterites in ver. 11.—(2) The analogy of Is. v. 20, where שִׂים לְ means to put for, exchange, substitute. (3) It preserves the continuity of Job's reflections on his own condition, and his immediate prospects. (4) The thought is in admirable harmony with the description which immediately follows, in which he represents himself as lingering on the verge of Sheol, awaiting his speedy departure thither, preparing his couch in that darkness which is so near, *etc.*—E.]

Ver. 13 seq. show how far Job was right in seeing before his eyes nothing but night and darkness, and in giving up the hope of a state of greater prosperity which was held up before him by the friends. Vers. 13, 14 form the conditional protasis, introduced by אִם on which all the verbs in both verses depend, ver. 15 being the apodosis, introduced by וְ consec. [Of which view of the construction, however, Delitzsch remarks: "There is no objection to this explanation so far as the syntax is concerned; but there will then be weighty thoughts which are also expressed in the form of fresh thoughts, for which independent clauses seem more appropriate, under the government of אִם as if they were pre-suppositions." And see below.]

Ver. 13. **If I hope for the underworld as my house** [or **abode**], **have spread in the darkness my couch.**—[Delitzsch agrees with the E. V. in the construction: "If I wait, it is for Sheol as my house." Gesenius, Fürst and Conant take אִם=הֵן, "Lo!" as in Hos. xii. 12; Jer. xxxi. 20.]

Ver. 14. **If I have cried out to the grave: Thou art my father!**—שַׁחַת, grave (comp. ch. ix. 31) in Heb. is strictly speaking feminine, here, however, it is construed *ad sensum* as a masculine (as is the case elsewhere with such feminines as קֶשֶׁת, נְחֹשֶׁת, דַּעַת, *etc.*, comp. Ges., Thes., p. 1378). It is unnecessary with the LXX., Vulg., Pesh., to take שחת here in the sense of "death," or with Nachman, Rosenm., Schlottm., Del. [E. V., Con., Car.], *etc.*, to assign to it the meaning: "corruption, rottenness" as though it were derived from שָׁחַת, not from שׁוּחַ, *fodere:* moreover the existence of such a second substant. שחת=corruption is susceptible of certain proof from no other passage. In regard to the bold poetic expression here given to the inward familiarity of Job with the state of death which lay before him, comp. Ps. lxxxviii. 19 [18]; Prov. vii. 4; also below ch xxx. 29.

Ver. 15. Apodosis: **Where then** (as to אֵפוֹ, which, notwithstanding the accents, is to be drawn into union with the preceding אַיֵּה, where? comp. on ch. ix. 24) **is** (now) **my hope? Yea, my hope, who sees it?** *i. e.*, who exhibits it to me as really well founded? who discloses it to me? In both clauses one and the same hope is intended, that *viz.* of the restoration of his prosperity in this life, even before death [this hope, Dillmann remarks, being the hope which, according to the friends, he *should* have, not the hope which, according to ver. 13, he really *has*].

Ver. 16. **To the bars of the grave it sinks down, when at the same time there is rest in the dust.**—The subject here also is תִּקְוָתִי, ver. 15, this hope being regarded as single, although the expression there was doubled. תֵּרַדְנָה is a poetic alternate form for תֵּרֵד (Ew., § 191, Gesen., § 47, Rem. 3), not third pers. plur., as the old translators [and E. V.] rendered the form, and as among moderns [Green, § 88, Schlottm.], Böttcher and Dillmann take it, the latter supposing that the hope which Job really had, mentioned in ver. 13, and the hope attributed to him by the friends in ver. 15, are the two subjects of the verb.—בַּדֵּי שְׁאֹל are "bars of the underworld, of the realm of the dead," not its "clefts" (Böttcher), nor its "bounds" (Hahn); for again in Ex. xxv. 13 seq.; xxvii. 6 seq.; Hos. xi. 6, בַּדִּים signifies "carrying poles," or "cross-beams" (*vectes*). And whereas, according to many other passages,

Sheol is represented as provided with doors or gates (ch. xxxviii. 17; Is. xxxviii. 10; Ps. ix. 14 [13]; cvii. 18), its "cross-beams" or "bars" signify essentially the same with its gates (comp. Lam. ii. 9). In יַחַד, "at the same time" (not "together" [E. V.], as Hahn renders it, understanding it to be affirmed of the descending hope, and of Job at his death). Job expresses a thought similar to that in ch. xiv. 22, the thought, namely, that *the rest of his body in the dust* coincides in time with the descent of the soul to Hades. נָחַת, pausal form for נַחַת, "rest," signifies here the rest of the lifeless body in the grave: comp. Is. xxvi. 19; Ps. xxii. 30 [29].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The central point of this new reply of Job's—and it is that which principally shows progress on the part of the sorely afflicted sufferer out of his spiritual darkness to a clearer perception and a brighter frame of mind—lies in the expression of *a yearning hope in his future justification by God*, which is found in the last section but one of the discourse, and which constitutes the real kernel of the argument. Inasmuch as the friends, instead of ministering to him loving sympathy and true comfort were become his "mockers" (ch. xvi. 20), he finds himself all the more urgently driven to God alone as his helper, and the guardian of his innocence. Hence it is that he now suddenly turns to the same God, whom he had just before described in the strongest language as his ferocious, deadly enemy and persecutor, as well as the author of the suffering inflicted on him even by his human enemies, and, full of confidence, calls Him his "witness in heaven," and his "attestor on high" (ver. 19), who is already near to him, and who will not permit the earth to drink up his blood, which cries out to heaven, and thus to silence his self-vindication (ver. 18). Nay, more: he lifts up his tearful eye with courageous supplication to God, praying Him that He would "do justice" to him before Himself, that He would represent him before His own judicial tribunal, interceding in his behalf, acquitting him, and thus vindicating his innocence against his human accusers (ver. 21). "We see distinctly here how Job's idea of God becomes brighter in that it becomes dualized (in that he prays to God Himself, the author of his sufferings, as his deliverer and helper). The God who delivers Job to death as guilty, and the God who cannot leave him unvindicated—even though it should be only after death—come forth distinct and separate as darkness from light out of the chaos of temptation. . . . . Thus Job becomes here the prophet of the issue of his own course of suffering; and over his relation to Eloah and to the friends, of whom the former abandons him to the sinner's death, and the latter declare him to be guilty, hovers the form of *the God of the future*, which now breaks through the darkness, from whom Job believingly awaits and implores what the God of the present withholds from him" (Del. i. 310-311).—The same duality between the God of the present as a God of terror, and the Redeemer-God of the future, becomes apparent in the earnest entreaty which is further on addressed to God, that He "would become a bondsman with Himself" for Job, seeing that He is the only possible guarantor of his innocence (ch. xvii. 3). Not less does this duality between a God of truth, who knows and attests his righteous conduct, and a God of absolute power and fury, lie also at the foundation of the confident declaration which concludes this whole section, according to which the righteous man, untroubled by the suspicions and attacks of his enemies, "holds fast on his way," and in respect of his innocence and purity only "increases in strength" (ver. 9). That to which Job here gives expression, primarily indeed in the form of entreaty, of yearning desire, or as an inference from religious and ethical postulates, acquires, when considered in its historical connection with his deliverance, the significance of an *indirect prophecy*, referring not only to the actual historical issue of his own suffering (which in fact ends with just such a vindication as he here wishes for himself), but also in general to the completed reconciliation of God with sinful humanity in Christ.—For this work of reconciliation was accomplished, according to 2 Cor. v. 19, precisely as Job here wishes for it. God was in Christ, and reconciled the world to Himself. He officiated as Judge, acquitting, and as Advocate, vindicating, in *one* person. He became in Christ His own Mediator with humanity (Gal. iii. 20), and caused that "suretyship with Himself" to come to pass, which Job here wishes and longs for, in that He sent His own Son to be the "Mediator" (μεσίτης, 1 Tim. ii. 5; Heb. xii. 24), or a "surety" (ἔγγυος, Heb. vii. 22) of the New Covenant, and so established for fallen humanity, subject to sin and to death, its penalty, an eternal redemption, which is ever renewed in each individual. The older expositors have for the most part failed to recognize this profounder typical and prophetic sense of the passage, obscured as it is by the erroneous translations of the verses in question given by the LXX. and the Vulgate. Comp. however the remarks of Cocceius below on ch. xvi. 19 seq.

2. Although however Job seems by the profound truth and the striking power of these bold prophetic anticipations of his future vindication to be making most significant advances in the direction of more correct knowledge, and to be at any rate far above the limited and elementary conceptions of his friends, there is nevertheless in the midst of all this soaring of his purer and better consciousness to God one thing perceptibly wanting. It is the penitent confession of his sins. He not only *calls* himself a "righteous" man, and "pure of hands," (ch. xvii. 9), but with all earnestness he regards himself as such (comp. ch. xvi. 17). He will by no means admit that his suffering is in any sense, or in any degree whatever, the punishment of his sins. In this particular he falls short of that which he himself has before this expressly conceded (ch. xiv. 4) As the friends, in consequence of their superficial judgment, greatly exaggerated his guilt, so he, by no means free as yet from Pelagian self-righteousness, exaggerates his innocence. The justification which he wishes and

hopes for, is not the New Testament δικαίωσις, that Divine act of grace declaring the repentant sinner righteous. It is only the Divine attestation of an innocence and freedom from sin, which he deems himself to possess in perfection. It thus stands very nearly related to that lawyer's "willing to justify himself" which is mentioned in Luke x. 29; and is altogether different from that disposition which at last the actual justification and restoration of Job to favor produced (ch. xlii. 6). Again—what he says in ch. xvi. 15 seq. of thrusting his horn into the dust, of continuous weeping, of wearing sackcloth, has no reference to signs of actual repentance (a view often met with in the ancient commentators); these things are simply indications of physical pain, referring to a humiliation which proceeded less out of a complete and profound acquaintance with sin, than out of the sense of severe painful suffering (comp. above on this passage). With this defective knowledge of self, and partial self-righteousness, in which Job shows himself to be as yet entangled, is closely connected the gross harshness of the judgment concerning the friends, with which he requites their inconsiderate words against himself; characterizing them as windy phrase-mongers (ch. xvi. 3), as unwise (ch. xvii. 4, 10), as impudent mockers (ch. xvi. 20; xvii. 2), as hard-hearted extortioners and distrainers (ch. xvii. 5), yea, as belonging to the category of "children of the world" (ch. xvii. 6), of the unrighteous and wicked (ch. xvi. 10, 11), of the profligate (ch. xvii. 8). Closely connected with it in like manner is the harsh and extreme judgment in which he indulges of that which *God* does against him; the description which he gives of Him as a mighty warrior rushing upon him with inexorable, nay with bloodthirsty cruelty (ch. xvi. 12-14), attributing to Him as the higher cause all the ignominy and injustice which he had suffered through the friends (ch. xvi. 11 seq.; xvii. 6 seq.). And finally here belongs the gloomy hopelessness in respect to the issue of his life into which his spirit sinks down again, (ch. xvii. 11-16) from the courage and confidence to which it had been raised in the last section but one. This despair is in palpable contradiction with the better confidence which like a flash of light had illuminated the darkness of his anguished soul, although it is in unison with the state of the sufferer's heart in this stage of his education in the school of suffering, lacking as it does as yet the complete exactness and purity of moral self-knowledge, and as a consequence the real stability and joyfulness of faith in God's power to save. So it is that the hope, which again emerges in his next discourse, that his innocence will be acknowledged in a better hereafter, is by no means held by him with a firm and decided grasp, but rather appears only as a transient flash across the prevailing darkness of his soul.

3. Job suffers as a righteous man, comparatively, and for that reason the complaints of his anguished heart in this discourse resemble even in manifold peculiarities of expression that which other righteous sufferers of the Old Testament say in the outgushings of their hearts, *e. g.*, the Psalmist in Ps. xxii. (comp. above on ch. xvi. 10), Ps. xliv. and lxix. (comp. especially the words: "I am made a byword to the world," ch. xvii. 6, with Ps. xliv. 15 [14], and lxix. 12 [11]); also the servant of Jehovah in the second division of Isaiah; comp. ch. xvii. 8, "the righteous are astonished thereat," with Isa. lii. 14; also ch. xvi. 16, 17—"My face is burning red with weeping, *etc.*, . . . although no wrong cleaves to my hands," *etc.*, with Isa. liii. 9—"although he hath done no violence, neither is any deceit found in his mouth:"—likewise ch. xvi. 19—"Even now behold in heaven my witness," with Is. l. 8 seq. ("He is near that justifieth me, who will condemn me?" *etc.*). Notwithstanding these and the like correspondences with the lamentations and prayers of other righteous sufferers, Seinecke (*Der Grundgedanke des B. Hiob*, 1863, p. 34 seq.) goes too far when, on the ground of such correspondences in this and in other discourses of Job, he regards Job as being in general an allegorical figure of essentially the same significance with the servant of God in Isaiah, and hence as a poetic personification of the suffering people of Israel. Scarcely can it be definitely said that the poet "by the relation to the passion-psalms stamped on the picture of the affliction of Job, has marked Job, whether consciously or unconsciously, as a typical person; that by taking up, and not unintentionally either, many national traits, he has made it natural to interpret Job as a *Mashal* of Israel" (Delitzsch I. 313). There is too evident a lack of distinct intimations of such a purpose on the part of the poet to justify us in assuming anything more than the fact that the illustrious sufferer of Uz has a typical significance for many pious sufferers of later (post-patriarchal, and post-solomonic) times, and that consequently later poets, the authors of the Lamentation-Psalms, or prophets (such as Isaiah, possibly also Ezekiel and Zechariah) borrowed many particular traits from the picture of his suffering. Moreover, in view of the uncertainty touching such a relation of the matter, we can only warn against any homiletic application of this Messianic-allegorical conception of Job as being essentially identical with the "servant of God." The exposition for practical edification of the section chap. xvi. 18–xvii. 9, with its rich yield of thought in biblical theology and the history of redemption, would gain little more by any attempts in this direction than the obscuration of the simple fact by useless and barren subtleties.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Chap. xvi. 7 seq. Oecolampadius: He makes use of three motives most suitable for conciliating pity, to wit: the manifest severity of his sufferings (vers. 7–14), repentance (??—vers. 15–16), and innocence (vers. 17–21).

Chap. xvi. 10 seq. Brentius: There is this in God's judgment that is most grievous—that He seems to favor our adversaries, and to stand on their side, by prospering their counsels and efforts against us. Nor is there any one who can endure this trial, unless thoroughly fortified by the word of God. Thus Christ Himself laments, saying: "Dogs have compassed me; the assembly of the wicked enclosed me" (Ps. xxii.).—Cramer: O soul, remember here thy Saviour, to

whom also such things happened; for He suffered pain in body and soul, was persecuted by His enemies, and forsaken, afflicted, and tortured by God Himself.

Chap. xvi. 19 seq.: He intimates that God's tribunal is above all tribunals; and when his mind and conscience, his faith and love toward God, cannot be recognised, appreciated or judged by any judge or witness, other than the Supreme, how can he do otherwise than appeal to Him? So the Apostle (1 Cor. iv. 3–4) repudiates every judgment but that of God . . . (On chap. xvii. 3.) Here he calls God, in whose power he is, his Surety; which is simply to ask that He would approve his appeal, and judge in accordance with it, so that if his adversary should carry the day, He would satisfy his claims. So we find elsewhere the pious, when wronged by an unrighteous judgment, appealing to the judgment of God, requesting Him to be their surety, as though they wished God to say to the adversary: This man is mine; enter thy suit, if any thing is due to thee, I will render satisfaction (Isa. xxxviii. 14; Ps. cxix. 122).

Ch. xvi. 22. Brentius: Death is here called a path, by which we do not return. For take away the Word, or Christ, and death seems to be eternal annihilation; add the Word and Christ, and death will be the beginning of the resurrection. . . . (On ch. xvii. 11 seq.). This despair of Job is described for our instruction, that we may learn: first, that no one can endure the judgment of death without God the Father; next that we may know by clear testimony that God alone is good, but every man a liar.

Ch. xvii. 11 seq. Starke: We see here how unlike are God's ways and thoughts, and those of men. Job had no other thought but that now it was all over with him, he would neither continue in life, nor again attain his former prosperity. And God had notwithstanding joined both these things together so wondrously and so gloriously, as the wished-for issue of Job's sufferings sufficiently proves. Delitzsch: Job feels himself to be inevitably given up as a prey to death, and as from the depth of Hades into which he is sinking, he stretches out his hands to God, not that He would sustain him in life, but that He would acknowledge him before the world as His. If he is to die even, he desires only that he may not die the death of a criminal. . . . When then the issue of the history is that God acknowledges Job as His servant, and after he is proved and refined by the temptation, preserves to him a doubly rich and prosperous life, Job receives beyond his prayer and comprehension; and after he has learned from his own experience that God brings to Hades and out again (1 Sam. ii. 6; comp. on the other hand above, ch. vii. 9), he has forever conquered all fear of death, and the germs of the hope of a future life, which in the midst of his affliction, have broken through his consciousness, can joyously expand.

II. Bildad and Job: Ch. XVIII—XIX.

A.—Bildad: Job's passionate outbreaks are useless, for the Divine ordinance, instituted from of old, is still in force, securing that the hardened sinner's doom shall suddenly and surely overtake him.

CHAPTER XVIII.

1. Sharp rebuke of Job, the foolish and blustering boaster:

VERS. 1–4.

1 Then answered Bildad the Shuhite, and said:

2 How long will it be ere ye make an end of words?
Mark, and afterwards we will speak.
3 Wherefore are we counted as beasts,
and reputed vile in your sight?
4 He teareth himself in his anger!
shall the earth be forsaken for thee?
and shall the rock be removed out of his place?

2. Description of the dreadful doom of the hardened evil-doer:

VERS. 5–21.

5 Yea, the light of the wicked shall be put out,
and the spark of his fire shall not shine.
6 The light shall be dark in his tabernacle,
and his candle shall be put out with him.

7 The steps of his strength shall be straitened,
and his own counsel shall cast him down.

8 For he is cast into a net by his own feet,
and he walketh upon a snare.
9 The gin shall take him by the heel,
and the robber shall prevail against him.
10 The snare is laid for him in the ground,
and a trap for him in the way.
11 Terrors shall make him afraid on every side,
and shall drive him to his feet.

12 His strength shall be hunger-bitten,
and destruction shall be ready at his side.
13 It shall devour the strength of his skin;
even the first-born of death shall devour his strength.
14 His confidence shall be rooted out of his tabernacle,
and it shall bring him to the king of terrors.

15 It shall dwell in his tabernacle, because it is none of his;
brimstone shall be scattered upon his habitation.
16 His roots shall be dried up beneath,
and above shall his branch be cut off.
17 His remembrance shall perish from the earth,
and he shall have no name in the street.

18 He shall be driven from light into darkness,
and chased out of the world.
19 He shall neither have son nor nephew among his people
nor any remaining in his dwellings.
20 They that come after him shall be astonished at his day,
as they that went before were affrighted.
21 Surely such are the dwellings of the wicked,
and this is the place of him that knoweth not God.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. In opposition to Job's solemn appeal to God as a witness of his innocence, Bildad continues fixed in his former preconceived opinion, that a secret crime must be the cause of his heavy burden of suffering. After a short, sharp, censorious introduction, in which he pays back Job's bitter and harsh reprimands in the same coin, (vers. 2-4), he shows that, notwithstanding Job's passionate bluster, the old divine decree was still in force, by virtue of which a sudden merited punishment from God carries off the hardened sinner, and with him his entire household and race (vers 5-21). He thus presents a companion piece to that description of the doom of the ungodly with which Eliphaz had closed his preceding discourse (ch. xv. 20-35), this delineation of Bildad's being new only in form, but being similar to that of Eliphaz throughout as to its substance and tendency. The whole discourse is divided into six strophes of three to four verses each, of which the first forms the introductory section spoken of above, while the remaining five belongs to the long main division, vers. 5-21.

2. *Introduction and First Strophe:* A short, sharp rebuke of Job as a foolish boaster, raving with passion; vers. 2-4.

Ver. 2. **How long will ye yet hunt for words?**—Let it be observed that Bildad's former discourse began with a like impatient question, ch. viii. 2 (there עַד־אָן, here עַד־אָנָה) and further, that he addresses his opponent in the plural, for the reason that the latter had himself first made *his* cause identical with the cause of all the righteous, and had thereby himself provoked this representative association of his person with all who were like-minded. ["Some say that he thinks of Job as one of a number; Ewald observes that the controversy becomes more wide and general [representing two great parties or divisions of mankind]: and Schlottmann conjectures that Bildad fixes his eye on individuals of his hearers, on whose countenances he believed he saw a certain inclination to side with Job. This conjecture we will leave to itself; but the remark which Schlottmann also makes that Bildad regards Job as a type of a whole class, is correct, only one must also add, this address in the plural is a reply to Job's sarcasm (ch. xii. 2) by a similar one. As Job has told his friends that they act as if they were mankind in general, and all wisdom were concentrated in them, so Bildad has taken it amiss that Job connects himself with the whole of the truly upright, righteous, and pure; and he ad-

dresses him in the plural because he, the unit, has puffed himself up as such a collective whole." Delitzsch]. Still further Job had also begun his last discourse (see ch. xvi. 3) with a complaint about the useless interminable discourse of the friends,—a complaint which Bildad here retaliates, although to be sure in an altered form. ["Job's speeches are long, and certainly are a trial of patience to the three, and the heaviest trial to Bildad, whose turn now comes on, because he is at pains throughout to be brief. Hence the reproach of endless babbling with which he begins here, as at ch. viii. 2." Del.]. שִׂים קִנְצֵי לְמִ׳ is not "to put an end to words, to make an end of speaking" (so the ancient versions, Rabbis, Rosenm., Gesen. [E. V. Umbreit, Lee, Carey, Renan]), *etc.;* for a plural קִנְצִים (with a resolved Daghesh for קִצִּים, [see Green, § 54 3]), for קֵץ cannot be shown elsewhere. Moreover in that case we should rather look for the singular construction שִׂים קֵץ (see ch. xxviii. 3). [Merx introduces the sing. into the text. Rodwell renders עַד־אָנָה as an exclamation, and the following Imperf. (like that of *b*) as an Imperative,—"How long? Make an end of words." So substantially Bernard, except that he supplies the clause following in ch. viii. 2. This construction however still leaves the plural קִנְצֵי unaccounted for. According to the usual construction the clause should have לֹא after עַד־אָנָה, to render which with E. V., *etc.* "How long will it be ere," *etc.*, is forced and gratuitous.—E.]. We are to take קִנְצֵי (with Castell., Schult., J. D. Michaelis, Ewald, Hirzel, Del. [Dillm., Schlottm., Con., Words.], *etc.*), as plur. constr. of קֶנֶץ, *laqueus* (a hunter's noose, a snare), so that the phrase under consideration signifies, "making a hunt for, hunting after words" (*laqueus verbis tendere, verba venando capere*). By this however is intended not contradiction and opposition perpetually renewed, but only uninterrupted, yet useless speaking. [Fürst, while agreeing with the above derivation of קִנְצֵי, explains it here as fig. for perversion, contortion: "how long will ye make a perversion of words?" But this explanation of the figure is less natural and appropriate. Bildad's charge against Job and his party is that they were hunting after words, straining after something to say, when there was really nothing to be said.—E.]—**Understand, and afterwards we will speak.**—תָּבִינוּ, "will you understand," voluntative for the Imperative בִּינוּ; comp. on ch. xvii. 10 *a*.

Ver. 3. **Why are we accounted as the brute?**—a harsh allusion to ch. xvii. 4, 10; comp. also Ps. lxxiii. 22.—**Are regarded as stupid in your eyes?**—נִטְמִינוּ, from טמה=טמא, טמם, "to stop up," hence lit. "are (are treated as) stopped up in your eyes," *i. e.* are in your opinion stupid, blockheads (comp. the similar phrase in Is. lix. 1). The LXX. exchange the word, which does not appear elsewhere, for נִדְמִינוּ, σεσιωπήκαμεν; the Targ. gives טמענא, "are sunk." The Vulg. finally (followed by many moderns, including Dillmann [Ewald, Noyes, Lee, Con., Car., Rod., and so E. V.]) derives the word from טמה=טמא, "to be impure" (Lev. xi. 43), and translates accordingly: *et sorduimus coram vobis.* But this meaning would be a stronger departure from that of the first member than is allowed by the structure of the verses elsewhere in this discourse, which exhibit throughout a thoroughly rigid parallelism. Moreover it would obscure too much the antithetic reference to ch. xvii. 8, 9.

Ver. 4. **O thou, who tearest thyself in thy rage.**—This exclamation, which is prefixed to the address proper to Job, and put in the third person ([so *apud Arabes ubique fere*, Schult.], comp. ch. xvii. 10 *a*), is in direct contradiction to the saying of Job in ch. xvi. 9, which represents him as torn by God, whereas he proves that the cause of the tearing is his own furious passion.—**For thee** [LXX. probably reading הֲבְמוֹתְךָ, which Merx adopts into the text, render ἐὰν σὺ ἀποθάνῃς] **should the earth be depopulated** [lit. forsaken] (comp. עזב in Is. vii. 16; vi. 12) [on the form תֵּעָזַב, with Pattach in the ultimate, see Green, § 91, 6], **and a rock remove out of its place** (comp. ch. xiv. 18; ix. 5). Both these things would come to pass if the moral order of the world, established by God as an unchangeable law, more especially as it reveals itself in rewarding the good and punishing the wicked, were to depart from its fixed course; or in other words, should God cease to be a righteous rewarder. For that, as Bildad thinks, is what Job really desires in denying his guilt; his passionate incessant assertion of his innocence points to a dissolution of the whole sacred fabric of universal order as established by God (comp. Rom. iii. 5, 6). [A fine and most effective stroke of sarcasm. On the one side, the puny, impotent storming of Job's wrath; on the other, the calm, unalterable movement of Divine Law. How foolish the former when confronting the latter! And by what right could *he* expect the Divine Order to be overthrown for *his* sake? For *thee* (emphatic) is everything to be plunged into desolation and chaos?—E.]

3. *The terrible doom of hardened sinners*, described as a salutary warning and instruction for Job: vers. 5-21.

Second Strophe: vers. 5-7. [The destruction of the wicked declared.]

Ver. 5. **Notwithstanding, the light of the wicked shall go out.**—גַּם adding to that which has already been said something new and unexpected, like ὅμως, equivalent to "notwithstanding;" comp. Ps. cxxix. 2; Ezek. xvi. 28. The "light going out" is a figure of prosperity destroyed (comp. ch. xxx. 26); so also in the second member: **and the flames of his fire shine not.** As to שְׁבִיב, "flame," comp. Dan. iii. 22; vii. 9. Also as to the transition from the plural in *a* ("wicked ones") to the sing. in *b* (*his* fire), see on ch. xvii. 5; Ewald, § 319, *a*.

Ver. 6. **The light darkens** (lit. "has darkened," חָשַׁךְ, Perf. of certainty, as in ch. v. 20) **in his tent** (comp. ch. xxi. 17; xxix. 3; Ps. xviii. 29 [28]; Prov. xiii. 9), **and his lamp above him** (*i. e.*, the lamp hanging down above

him from the covering of his tent, comp. Eccles. xii. 6) **goes out.**—This figure of the extinction of the light of prosperity which is repeated again and again, is alike familiar to the Hebrew and to the Arabian; the latter also says: "Fate has put out my light."

Ver. 7. **His mighty steps** [lit. the steps of his strength] **are straitened**: another figure which is "just as Arabic as it is Biblical" (Del.). Comp. in regard to it Prov. iv. 12; Ps. xviii. 37 [36]. Also as regards the form יֵצְרוּ (not from יָצַר, as Gesen. [Fürst], and Hirzel say, but Imperf. form צרר, see Ewald, § 138, *b*. [The meaning is clearly: his movements are hampered, his powers are contracted by the pent-up limits which shut him in].—**And his own counsel casts him down**: comp. ch. v. 12 seq., and as regards עֵצָה in the bad sense of the counsel of the wicked, see ch. x. 3; xxi. 16.

Third Strophe: vers. 8-11. [Everything conspires to destroy the sinner.]

Ver. 8. **For his feet drive him into a net**: lit. "he is driven, sent forth" (שֻׁלַּח, precisely as in Judg. v. 15) [by or with his own feet. A vivid paradoxical expression, conveying also a profound truth. The sinner is driven, and yet rushes on to his ruin. He is divided against himself. He pursues his course at once with and against his will.—E.]—**And he walks over pitfalls.**—שְׂבָכָה, net-like, cross-barred work, or lattice-work, applied here specially to a snare (as in Arabic *schabacah*, snare), hence a cross-barred covering laid over a deep pit. ["He thinks he is walking upon solid ground, but he is grievously mistaken; it is but a delicate net-work, spread over an unfathomable abyss, into which, therefore, he every moment risks to be precipitated." Bernard.]

Vers. 9, 10 continue still further the same figures derived from hunting, snare, cord and noose. In vers. 8–10 there are *six* different implements mentioned as being in readiness to capture the evil-doer; a vivid variety of expression which reminds us of the five names given to the lion by Eliphaz, ch. iv. 10 seq.; comp. also on ch. xix. 13 seq.

Ver. 9. **A trap holds his heel fast, and a snare takes fast hold upon him.**—To the simple אחז, to hold, corresponds in *b* the significantly stronger חזק, which, however, is used with עַל [instead of בְּ], thus giving expression to the idea of a mighty, overpowering seizure. [The jussive form יַחֲזֵק is used simply by poetic license.] On צַמִּים, snare [which is not plur., but sing., after the form צַדִּיק, from צמם], comp. on ch. v. 5. [The rendering of E. V.: "robbers" is to be rejected here, as well as in ch. v. 5.]

Ver. 10. **Hidden in the ground is his cord, and his gin upon the pathway.**—[The suffixes here undoubtedly refer to the sinner, and not, according to Conant's rendering—"its cord—its noose"—to the snare of ver. 9. "The continuation in ver. 10 of the figure of the fowler affirms that that issue of his life, ver. 9, has been preparing long beforehand; the prosperity of the evil-doer from the beginning tends towards ruin." Del.]

Ver. 11 unites the figures by way of explanation in a more general expression.—**On every side terrors affright him.**—בַּלָּהוֹת signifies two things at once—terrible thoughts and terrible circumstances, here naturally such as are sent by God upon the wicked to disturb him.—**And scare him at his footsteps**; *i. e.* pursuing him: לְרַגְלָיו meaning "step for step, close behind;" comp. Gen. xxx. 30; 1 Sam. xxv. 42; Is. xli. 2; Hab. iii. 5.—[E. V. "shall drive him to his feet" is ambiguous.] הֵפִיץ, lit. *diffundere, dissipare*, hence requiring a collective for its object (as *e. g.* "host" in Hab. iii. 14), or a word representing a mass (as *e. g.* "cloud, smoke," comp. Job xxxvii. 11; xl. 11, *etc.*); here, however, exceptionally connected with a single individual as its object, and hence synonymous with רדף, to chase, scare (comp. ch. xxx. 15). ["It would probably not be used here, but for the idea that the spectres of terror pursue him at every step, and are now here, now there, and his person is multiplied." Del.]

Fourth Strophe: vers. 11–14. Description of the final overthrow of the wicked in its three stages: outward adversity, mutilation of the body by disease, and death—hence manifestly pointing at Job.

Ver. 12. **His calamity shows itself hungry.**—The voluntat. יְהִי used for the finite: comp. ver. 9, also below ch. xxiv. 14.—אֹנוֹ, defective for אוֹנוֹ, is more correctly derived from אָוֶן in the sense of calamity, misfortune, than from אוֹן, "strength." The latter rendering, which is adopted by the Vulgate. Rosenm., Ewald, Stickel, Schlottm., Dillm. [E. V., Umbreit, Good, Lee, Wem., Noyes, Con., Car., Rod., Elz.], yields a sense which is in itself entirely appropriate: "then does his strength become hungry." ["But this rendering is unsatisfactory, for it is in itself no misfortune to be hungry, and רָעֵב does not in itself signify 'exhausted with hunger.' It is also an odd metaphor that strength becomes hungry." Delitzsch.] But the rendering favored by the Peshito, Hirzel, Hahn, Del. [Renan, Words.], *etc.*—"his calamity shows itself hungry (towards him); it seems greedy, eager to devour him" agrees better both with the second member of the parallelism, and with the actual course of Job's adversity, which began with a series of external calamities suddenly bursting upon him, to which Bildad manifestly refers. The explanation of the Targ. [and Bernard]—"the son of his manhood's strength (comp. אוֹן in Gen. xlix. 3) becomes hungry" destroys the connection [and "sounds comical rather than tragic," Del.]; and Reiske's translation—"he is hungry *in the midst of* his strength"—assumes the correctness of the conjectural reading רָעֵב בְּאֹנוֹ, which is entirely without support.—**And destruction** (אֵיד, lit. "a heavy burden, a load of suffering," hence stronger than אָוֶן, comp. ch. xxi. 17; Obad. 13) **is ready for his fall.**—לְצַלְעוֹ might of itself signify "at his side" (lit. "rib"), being

thus equivalent to בִּידוֹ, ch. xv. 23 (Gesen., Ew., Schlottm., Dillm.), [E. V., Good, Lee, Bernard, Wem., Words., Noy., Ren., Con., Car., Rod., Elz.]; but a more forcible meaning is obtained, if in accordance with Psalm xxxv. 15; xxxviii. 18, we take צֶלַע to mean "limping, fall," and so find destruction represented as in readiness to cast down the wicked.

Ver. 13. **There devours the parts of his skin** (בַּדִּים elsewhere "cross bars," or "branches of a tree," comp. ch. xvii. 16; used here of the members of the body: עוֹר here for the body; comp. on ch. ii. 4), **there devours his parts the first-born of death** [or with a smoother English construction, by inverting the order of clauses, as Rodwell: "The first-born of death shall devour—devour the limbs of his body"]. According to this rendering, which is already justified by the ancient versions, and which has of late been quite generally adopted, בְּכוֹר מָוֶת is the subject of the whole verse, and is placed for emphasis at the end. By this "first-born of death," we are to understand not the "angel of death" as the Targum explains it, nor again "death" itself, as Hahn thinks, but *a peculiarly dangerous and terrible disease*, ["in which the whole destroying power of death is contained, as in the first-born the whole strength of his parent." Del.]. Comp. the Arabic designation of fatal fevers as *benât el-menîjeh*, "daughters of fate or death." The whole verse thus points with indubitable clearness to Job's disease, the elephantiasis, which devours the limbs and mutilates the body,—an allusion which is altogether lost, if, with Umbreit and Ewald, we make the wicked himself the subject of the verse, understanding him to be designated in *b* by way of apposition as "the first-born of death, *i. e.*, as surely doomed to death, and to be compared in the rest of the verse to one in hunger devouring his own limbs, as in Is. ix. 19 [20].

Ver. 14. **He is torn out of his tent, wherein he trusted:** מִבְטַחוֹ as in ch. viii. 14. [מִבְטַחוֹ is taken as the subject of the sentence by E. V., Rosenm., Umbr., Ewald. Noyes, Bernard. Good, Lee, Wemyss, Carey, Barnes, Rod.. Merx, Delitzsch; the meaning being as explained by the latter: "Everything that makes the ungodly man happy as head of a household, and gives him the brightest hopes of a future, is torn away from his household, so that he, who is dying off, alone survives." The rendering of our Comm. is adopted by Dillmann, Schlottm., Conant, Renan, Hirzel, Hahn, Heiligst.—It is defended by Dillmann on the ground that according to the order of the description the fate of his tent and household is not mentioned until verse 15; and also that by its position מבטחו stands in apposition to אהלו, whereas according to the other construction the order should have been inverted, מבטחו as subject coming immediately after the verb: grounds which seem satisfactory. —E.].—**And he must march to the king of terrors:** lit., "and it makes him march" (תצעידהו fem. used as neuter), *viz.*, his calamity, the dismal something, the secret power which effects his ruin. ["After the evil-doer is tormented for a while with temporary בלהות, and made tender and reduced to ripeness for death by the first-born of death, he falls into the possession of the king of בלהות himself; slowly and solemnly, but surely and inevitably (as תצעיד implies, with which is combined the idea of the march of a criminal to the place of execution), he is led to this king by an unseen arm." Delitzsch]. The "king of terrors" is death himself, who is here, as in Ps. xlix. 15 [14]; Is. xxviii. 15 personified as a ruler of the under-world. He is not however to be identified with the king of the under-world in the heathen mythologies (*e. g.*, with the Yama of the Hindus, or the Pluto of the Romans, with whom Schärer and Ewald here institute a comparison), nor with Satan. For although the latter is in Heb. ii. 14 designated as *ὁ τὸ κράτος ἔχων τοῦ θανάτου*, in our book according to ch. i. 6 seq., he appears in quite another character than that of a prince of death. Neither can the Angel of the abyss, Abaddon (Rev. ix. 11) be brought into the comparison here, since the king of terrors is unmistakably the personification of *death itself*. We produce an unsuitable enfeebling of the sense if, with the Pesh., Vulg., Böttcher, Stickel, [Parkhurst, Noyes, Good, Wemyss, Carey] disregarding the accentuation we separate בַּלָּהוֹת from מֶלֶךְ, and render it as subj. of תצעידהו: "and destruction makes him march onward to itself, as to a king" [or: "Terror pursues him like a king," Noyes]—a rendering which is made untenable by the disconnected and obscure position which, in the absence of a clause more precisely qualifying it, it assigns to לְמֶלֶךְ (instead of which we might rather look for כְּמֶלֶךְ).

Fifth Strophe: Vers. 15–17. Description of the influence of the calamity as extending beyond the death of the wicked man, destroying his race, his posterity, and his memory.

Ver. 15. **There dwells in his tent that which does not belong to him:** or again: "of that which is not his." For מִבְּלִי־לוֹ may be rendered in both ways, either partitively (Hirzel), or, which is to be preferred, as a strengthened negation = אֲשֶׁר מִבְּלִי־לוֹ, "that which is not his" (comp. the adverbial מִבְּלִי in Ex. xiv. 11; also the similar, yet more frequent מֵאֵין; and in general Ewald, § 294, *a*). In any case לֹא־לָהּ in ch. xxxix. 16 may be compared with it. The fem. תשכון (for neuter) is explained on the ground that the forsaken tent is thought of as being inhabited not by human beings, but by wild beasts (Is. xiii. 20 seq.; xxxiv. 11 seq.), or wild vegetation (Zeph. ii. 9). —**Brimstone is scattered on his habitation**, *viz.*, from heaven (Gen. xix. 24) in order to make it, the entire habitation of the wretched man (נָוֵהוּ as in ch. v. 3) a solitude, the monument of an everlasting curse; comp. ch. xv. 34; Deut. xxix. 22; Ps. xi. 6; also the remark of Wetzstein in Delitzsch, founded on personal observation of present modes of thought and customs among the orientals: "The desolation of his

house is the most terrible calamity for the Semite; *i. e.*, when all belonging to his family die, or are reduced to poverty, their habitation is desolated, and their ruins are become the byword of future generations. For the Bedouin especially, although his hair tent leaves no mark, the thought of the desolation of his house, the extinction of his hospitable hearth, is terrible."

Ver. 16. **His roots dry up from beneath, and his branch** (קָצִיר as in ch. xiv. 9) **withers above** (not, "is lopped off," Del. [E. V., Conant, *etc.*] comp. above on ch. xiv. 2): ["the derivation from מלל "to cut off." is here altogether untenable, for the cutting off of the branches of a tree dried up in the roots is meaningless." Dillm.]. The same vegetable figure, in illustration of the same thing; see above, ch. xv. 32 seq.; comp. Amos ii. 9; Is. v. 24, also the inscription on the sarcophagus of Eschmunazar: "Let there not be to him a root below or a branch above!"

Ver. 17. **His memory perishes out of the land, and he has no** (longer a) **name on the** (wide) **plain**—As אֶרֶץ in the first member denotes the "land with a settled population," so חוּץ denotes the region *outside of* this inhabited land, the wide plain, steppe, wilderness. Comp. on ch. v. 10, also the parallel phrase אֶרֶץ וְחוּצוֹת in Prov. viii. 26 (see on the passage).

Sixth Strophe (together with a closing verse): Vers. 18-21. [After his destruction the wicked lives in the memory of posterity only as a warning example].

Ver. 18. **He is driven out of the light into the darkness** (*i. e.*, out of the light of life and happiness into the darkness of calamity and death), **and chased out of the habitable world.** יְנִדֻּהוּ, from the Hiph. הֵנֵד of the verb נדד; תֵּבֵל used of the *inhabited* globe, the *οἰκουμένη*. The third plural of both verbs expresses the subject indefinitely, as in ch. iv. 19; vii. 3; xix. 26. It would be legitimate to take as the object referred to by the suffixes, not the wicked man himself, but his שֵׁם and זֵכֶר (Seb. Schmidt, Ewald). The following verse however makes this interpretation less probable.

Ver. 19. **No sprout, no shoot** (remains) **to him among his people.**—The phrase "sprout and shoot" will most nearly and strikingly reproduce the short and forcible alliteration of נִין וְנֶכֶד, which is found also in Gen. xxi. 23; Is. xiv. 22.—**And there is no escaped one** (שָׂרִיד, as in Deut. ii. 34, *etc.*), **in his dwellings.** מָגוּר, "lodging, dwelling," elsewhere only in Ps. lv. 16. The whole verse expresses, only still more directly and impressively, what was first of all said figuratively above in ver. 16.

Ver. 20. **They of the West are astonished on account of his day** (*i. e.*, the day of doom, of destruction; comp. יוֹם in Ps. xxxvii. 13; cxxxvii. 7; Obad. 12, *etc.*), **and they of the East are seized with terror** (lit., "they take fright," seize upon terror, in accordance with a mode of expression employed also in ch. xxi. 6; Isa. xiii. 8; Hos. x. 6. The אַחֲרוֹנִים, as well as the קַדְמֹנִים, might certainly, according to the general usage of the words elsewhere, denote "posterity," together with the "ancestors" (*i. e.*, the fathers, now living, of the later generations), hence the successors of the wicked, together with his contemporaries. So, besides the ancient versions [and E. V.], many moderns, *e. g.* Hirzel, Schlottmann, Hahn [Lee, Bernard, Noyes, Conant, Wordsworth, Renan, Rodwell], *etc.* A more suitable meaning is obtained, however, if (with Schultens, Oetinger, Umbreit, Ewald, Delitzsch, Dillmann), [Wemyss, Barnes, Carey, Elzas, Merx], we take the words in a local sense: the "men of the west," the "men of the east," the neighbors on both sides, those who live towards the east, and those who live towards the west [Dillmann inelegantly: "those to the rear, and those to the front"]. Comp. the well-known designation of the Mediterranean as הים האחרון (the western sea), and of the Dead Sea as הקדמוני (the eastern sea). [Del. objects to the former rendering: "The return from the posterity to those then living is strange, and the usage of the language is opposed to it; for קדמנים is elsewhere always what belongs to the previous age *in relation to the speaker; e. g.* 1 Sam. xxiv. 14; comp. Eccles. iv. 16." Schlottmann, on the other hand, argues that the temporal sense is much better suited to the entire connection than the local.]

Ver. 21. A concluding verse, which properly lies outside of the strophe-structure of the discourse, similar to ch. v. 27; viii. 19.—**Only thus does it befall the dwellings of the unrighteous, and thus the place of him who** (לֹא־יָדַע without אֲשֶׁר, comp. ch. xxix. 16; Gesen., § 116 [§ 121], 3), **knew not God:** *i. e.* did not recognize and honor God, did not concern himself about Him (ch. xxiv. 1). Hahn, Dillmann, *etc.*, correctly render אַךְ at the beginning of this verse not affirmatively,="yea, surely," but restrictively—"only so, not otherwise does it happen to the dwellings of the unrighteous," *etc.* For it is only by this rendering that Bildad's whole description receives the emphatic conclusion which was to be expected after its solemn and pathetic opening, ver. 5 seq.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Bildad appears here again, as in his former discourse, ch. viii., *as essentially an imitator of Eliphaz*, without being able to present much that is new in comparison with his older associate and predecessor. So far as his picture of the restless condition and irretrievable destruction of the wicked (ver. 4 seq.) is in all essentials a copy of that of Eliphaz in ch. xv. 20 seq., while at the same time this, instead of being the subject of a particular section, runs through his entire argument as its all-controlling theme, he appears poorer in original ideas than his model. At the same time he rivals, and indeed surpasses, his associate now again, as before, in wealth of imagery and in the variety of his illustrations derived from the life of nature and humanity, for the vivid and skilful handling of which the

speaker is pre-eminently distinguished among the three friends. He uses the peculiar phraseology of the Chokmah with consummate art; and this aptness and elegance of style compensates in a measure for its lack of originality. Especially does his terrible portraiture of the wicked man encountering his doom, like that of Eliphaz in ch. xv., or even in a higher degree than that in some particulars, acquire by virtue of these qualities a peculiar significance as regards its æsthetic beauty, its relation to scriptural theology, and its parenetic value. "The description is terribly brilliant, solemn and pathetic, as becomes the stern preacher of repentance with haughty mien and pharisaic self-confidence; it is none the less beautiful, and, considered in itself, also true—a masterpiece of the poet's skill in poetic idealizing, and in apportioning out the truth in dramatic form." (Delitzsch i. 332). Especially are the gradual steps in the destruction of the wicked (ver. 12 seq.), and the participation of all that he leaves behind him, of his posterity, his property, and his memory, in his own sudden downfall and total ruin (ver. 15 seq.), described with masterly power. All this is presented with such internal truth, and in such harmony with the experiences of all mankind, that the description, considered in itself, and detached from its connections, is well adapted to exert a salutary influence for all time in the way of warning and exhortation, and edification even for the Christian world.

2. It is true nevertheless that the malignant application to the person of Job of the sharp points and venomous stings of this portraiture, wonderful as it is in itself, destroys the pure enjoyment of the study of it, and warns the thoughtful reader at every step to exercise caution in the acceptance of these maxims of wisdom, which, while sounding beautifully, are applied solely and altogether in the service of an illiberal legal pharisaic and narrow view of life. ["Bildad knows nothing of the worth and power which a man attains by a righteous heart. By faith he is removed from the domain of God's justice, which recompenses according to the law of works, and before the power of faith even rocks remove from their place" (see ver. 4). Delitzsch.] The unmistakable directness of the allusions to Job's former calamities (in vers. 12-14 which point to the frightful disease which afflicted him; in ver. 15, where the shower of brimstone is a reminder of ch. i. 16 seq., and in ver. 16, where the "withering of the branch" points to the death of the children) takes away from the description, although true in itself, that which alone could constitute it a universal truth, and lowers it to the doubtful rank of a representation having a partisan purpose. It compels us to regard its author, moreover, as a preacher of morality entangled in a carnal, external, legal dogmatism, destitute of all earnest, deep and pure experience of the nature of human sin, as well as of the divine righteousness, and for that very reason misunderstanding the real significance of Job's sufferings, and doing gross injustice to his person. We are thus constrained to put Bildad, as a practical representative and teacher of the Divine wisdom of the Old Testament, far below his opponent. The practical commentator, especially when engaged in the continuous exposition of the whole poem, cannot help keeping in view these considerations, which impair the religious and ethical value of this discourse. In its characteristic traits and motives, it yields comparatively little that is directly profitable and edifying.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 3 seq. OECOLAMPADIUS: Truly the ungodly are vile in the eyes of the godly, and are recognized as being more stupid than brutes; but this is in accordance with a healthy judgment, and free from contempt. For the world was even crucified to Paul, yet what did he not do that he might benefit those who were in the world? The godly therefore seem vile to the ungodly in quite a different sense from that in which the ungodly seem vile to the godly; for to the one class belongs charity, which the other class in every way neglect; the former act without pride, the latter with the utmost pride.—BRENTIUS (on ver. 4): It is no common trial of faith, that we must think of ourselves as not being of such consequence with God that He for our sakes should change common events, and His own pre-established order. . . . We seem to think that God rather will change His usual course on our account.—WOHLFARTH: God's plan is indeed unchangeable and without exceptions, alike in the realm of nature, and in that of spirit. But we must beware of erring by arguing from that which is external to that which is internal. In that which pertains to the spiritual, the higher, that which is to decide is, not external indications, but reason, Scripture, and conscience.

Ver. 5 seq. BRENTIUS: These curses on the wicked are that his light may be put out, and that the spark of his fire may not shine. For the Lord and His Word are true light and splendor, as David says (Ps. xxxvi. 10 [9]; cxix. 105). The wicked have neither, for they say in their heart: There is no God.—V. GERLACH: The light is here in general the symbol of a clear knowledge of man's destiny, of serene consciousness in the whole life (Matt. vi. 22 seq.); the light of the tent carries the symbol further, and points to this clearness, even in a man's daily household affairs, as something which ceases to be for the ungodly.

Ver. 17 seq. LANGE: The memory which a man leaves behind him is of little consequence; it is enough if we are known to God in respect of that which is good. Many righteous souls are hidden from the world, because they have wrought their works in the most quiet way in God (John iii. 21): while, on the contrary, many an ungodly man makes noise and disturbance enough, so that he is talked about after his death. . . . . . But to the believing child of God it is still granted as his special beatitude that he shall see God, who will make his life an example, bringing it forth into the light, and causing it even after his death to shed a sweet savor to the praise of God (Prov. x. 7).

Ver. 21. BRENTIUS: Truly it is not without

purpose that the Holy Spirit so often, even *ad fastidium* sets forth in this book the judgment which befalls the ungodly; it is to admonish us, lest we should be disturbed by the prosperity of the ungodly, knowing that the judgment hangs over their head, and will be executed most speedily, as you have most impressively set forth in regard to this matter in Ps. lxxiii. For although the application of these judgments to Job by the friends is altogether forced, their opinions nevertheless are most true, and are written for our instruction.—WOHLFARTH (on vers 5–21): By what tokens can we determine that any one truly reveres God? Not by his scrupulous attention to the external observances of religion, not by the external events which befall him, not by the individual good works which he does, but by the *faith* which he confesses, by the whole direction of his life toward that which is Godlike, by the composure with which he dies: Ps. lxxiii. 17, 19, *etc.*

B.—Job: His misery is well-deserving of sympathy; it will, however, all the more certainly end in his conspicuous vindication by God, although not perchance till the life beyond.

CHAPTER XIX. 1–29.

(Introduction: Reproachful censure of the friends for maliciously suspecting his innocence:)

VERS. 1–5.

1 Then Job answered, and said:

2 How long will ye vex my soul,
and break me in pieces with words?
3 These ten times have ye reproached me;
ye are not ashamed that ye make yourselves strange to me.
4 And be it indeed that I have erred,
mine error remaineth with myself.
5 If indeed ye will magnify yourselves against me,
and plead against me my reproach:

1. Sorrowful complaint because of the suffering inflicted on him by God and men:

VERSES 6–20.

6 Know now that God hath overthrown me,
and hath compassed me with His net.
7 Behold, I cry out of wrong, but I am not heard;
I cry aloud, but there is no judgment.
8 He hath fenced up my way, that I cannot pass,
and He hath set darkness in my paths.
9 He hath stripped me of my glory,
and taken the crown from my head.
10 He hath destroyed me on every side, and I am gone;
and mine hope hath he removed like a tree.
11 He hath also kindled His wrath against me,
and He counteth me unto Him as one of His enemies.
12 His troops come together,
and raise up their way against me,
and encamp round about my tabernacle.

13 He hath put my brethren far from me,
and mine acquaintance are verily estranged from me.
14 My kinsfolk have failed,
and my familiar friends have forgotten me.
15 They that dwell in mine house, and my maids, count me for a stranger;
I am alien in their sight.

16 I called my servant, and he gave me no answer;
I entreated him with my mouth.
17 My breath is strange to my wife,
though I entreated for the children's sake of mine own body.
18 Yea, young children despised me;
I arose, and they spake against me.
19 All my inward friends abhorred me;
and they whom I loved are turned against me.
20 My bone cleaveth to my skin and my flesh,
and I am escaped with the skin of my teeth.

2. **A lofty flight to a blessed hope in God, his future Redeemer and Avenger:**

VERSES 21–27.

21 Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O ye my friends!
for the hand of God hath touched me.
22 Why do ye persecute me as God,
and are not satisfied with my flesh?
23 O that my words were now written!
O that they were printed in a book!
24 —that they were graven with an iron pen
and lead in the rock for ever!
25 For I know that my Redeemer liveth,
and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth:
26 and though after my skin worms destroy this body,
yet in my fl sh shall I see God;
27 whom I shall see for myself,
and mine eyes shall behold, and not another,
though my reins be consumed within me.

3. **Earnest warning to the friends against the further continuance of their attacks:**

VERSES 28, 29.

28 But ye should say, Why persecute we him,
seeing the root of the matter is found in me?
29 Be ye afraid of the sword;
for wrath bringeth the punishments of the sword,
that ye may know there is a judgment.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Deeply grieved by the warnings and threatenings of Bildad's discourse, which in these respects was but an echo of that of Eliphaz, Job, on the one side, advances his complaint even to the point of imploring pity from his opponents in view of his inexpressible misery; on the other hand, for the very reason that he, being innocent, finds himself deprived of all human help and sympathy, he lifts himself up to a more courageous confidence in God's assistance than he has ever yet exhibited. He expresses the well-defined hope of a vindication awaiting him—if not on this side of the grave, then at least beyond it—through the personal intervention of God, appearing to him in visible form. That anguished complaint concerning his unspeakably severe suffering (vers. 6–20) is preceded by a sharp word, addressed by way of introduction to the friends, as having maliciously suspected his innocence (vers. 2–5). That inspired declaration of his hope in the divine vindication which was to take place in the Hereafter (vers. 21–27) is in like manner followed by a short but forcible and impressive warning to the friends in view of their sinning against him (vers. 28–29). The whole discourse, accordingly, which is characterized by vivid emotion and decided contrarieties of feeling, contains four principal parts, which embrace five strophes of unequal length. The three longest of these strophes, each being of 7–8 verses, fall into the second and third parts, of which the former contains two strophes, the latter one. The short introductory and concluding strophes are identical with the first and fourth parts.

2. *Introduction:* Reproachful censure of the friends for their malicious suspicion of his innocence (vers. 2–5).

Ver. 2. The discourse begins—like that of Bildad, with a *Quousque tandem* (עַד־אָנָה), which, however, is incomparably more emphatic and significant than that of his accuser, because it has more to justify it **How long will ye vex my soul and crush me with words?**—תֹּנְיוּן is *fut. energicum* of הוֹגָה, with the third radical retained (GESEN. § 75 [§ 74], Rem. 16). In

regard to the form תְּרַכְּאוּנַנִי (with suffix appended to the ן of the *fut. energ.* and with the union-vowel *a*), see GESEN. § 60 [§ 59], Rem. 3 [GREEN, § 105 *c*].

Ver. 3 gives the reason for the עַד־אָנָה. **Now already ten times is it that ye reproach me,** *viz.*, by assailing my innocence—זֶה here in the sense of "already, now already," comp. EWALD, § 183 *a* [GESEN. § 122, 2, Rem.; Lex. 3. It may, however, be equally well regarded as a pronoun, in its usual demonstrative sense, in the singular with עֶשֶׂר, with perhaps an interjectional force—"Lo! these ten times do ye reproach me." So Renan: *Voilà la dixième fois que vous m' insultez.* Comp. Gen. xxvii. 36.—E.] "Ten times" stands naturally for a round number, or ideal perfection: Gen. xxxi. 7; Lev. xxvi. 26; Num. xiv. 22, *etc.* ["Ten, from being the number of the fingers on the human hand, is the number of human possibility, and from its position at the end of the row of numbers (in the decimal system) is the number of that which is perfected; as not only the Sanskrit daçan is traceable to the radical notion 'to seize, embrace,' but also the Semitic עשׂר is traceable to the radical notion, 'to bind, gather together' (cogn. קשׁר). They have already exhausted what is possible in reproaches—they have done their utmost." DEL.]. Comp. my *Theologia Naturalis*, p. 713 seq.; also LEYRER's Art. "*Zahlen bei den Hebräern*" in HERZOG's *Real-Encyclop.* XVIII. p. 378 seq.). **Are not ashamed to stun me.**—The syntax of לֹא־תֵבֹשׁוּ תַּהְכְּרוּ ("ye stun [me] without shame, shamelessly"), as in chap. vi. 28; x. 16. Comp. GESEN. § 142 [§ 139], 3 *b* [GREEN, § 269].—תַּהְכְּרוּ is a shortened Imperf. Hiph. for תַּהְכִּירוּ (GESEN. § 53 [§ 52], Rem. 4, 5 [see also GREEN, § 94 *c*]), of a verb הכר, which does not appear elsewhere, which, according to the Arabic, signifies "to stun," *obstupefacere.* The rendering "to maltreat, to abuse grossly," which rests on the authority of the ancient versions (LXX.: ἐπίκεισθέ μοι, Vulg. *opprimentes*), and which is adopted by Ewald, Hirzel, Dillmann, *etc.*, gives essentially the same sense. [The rendering of E. V.: "ye are not ashamed that ye make yourselves strange to me" seems to have been suggested by the use of נכר in the sense of "not to know." The Hiph. form of the verb, however, is not found in that sense, which is, moreover, less suitable to the context than the renderings given above.—E.]

Ver. 4. **And verily even if I have erred** (comp. chap. vi. 24) [אַף־אָמְנָם, double intensive, "yea, verily, comp. chap. xxxiv. 12], **my error remains** (then) **with me,** *i. e.*, it is then known only to me (אִתִּי, "with me=in my consciousness," comp. chap. xii. 3; xiv. 5), and so does not fall under your jurisdiction, does not call for your carping, unfriendly criticism; for such a wrong, being known to myself alone (and for that reason being of the lighter sort), I have to answer only to God. ["I shall have to expiate it, without your having on this account any right to take upon yourselves the office of God, and to treat me uncharitably; or what still better corresponds with אִתִּי תָּלִין: my transgression remains with me, without being communicated to another, *i. e.*, without having any influence over you or others to lead you astray, or involve you in participation of the guilt." DEL.]. So in substance—and correctly—Hirzel, Schlottmann, Hahn, Delitzsch, Dillmann [Renan, Carey, Rodwell], while Ewald and Olshausen, failing to perceive the relation of the first member as a hypothetical antecedent to the second member as its consequent and opposite, translate: "I have erred, I am fully conscious of my error." [If this be understood as a confession by Job of moral guilt, it is premature and out of place. According to Ewald, it is a confession of intellectual error (to wit, that he had vainly put his confidence in the justice of God), uttered with the view of softening the hostility of the friends, by the indirect admission, on the one hand, that their charges had some justification in the non-appearance of God; by the reminder, on the other hand, that his complaint was against God rather than them. But such a thought would be too obscurely expressed, and would imply too sudden a change from the tone of bitter reproach which pervades this opening strophe.—E.]

Ver. 5. **Will ye really boast yourselves against me, and prove against me my reproach?**—אִם is to be taken, with Schultens, Ewald, Hirzel, Dillmann [Renan: "By what right do you dare to speak insolently to me, and do you pretend to convince me of disgrace?"], as an interrogative particle (=*an*), and the whole verse as a question, with the chief emphasis resting on the verbs תַּגְדִּילוּ ("will you [magnify] boast yourselves," exhibit yourselves against me as great rhetoricians and advocates, by your elaborate accusations?) and תּוֹכִיחוּ ("will you judicially prove, demonstrate" my disgrace [עָלַי, against me]? comp. chap. xiii. 3, 15, and often). This is the only construction which properly completes ver. 4. There is no such completing of the sense obtained, if we take אִם as a conditional particle—"if," whether we take the whole of the fifth verse as a hypothetical protasis, and ver. 6 as apodosis (so Clericus, Olshausen, Delitzsch) [E. V., Lee, Carey, Rodwell, Merx], or regard ver. 5 *a* as protasis, and *b* as apodosis (so Umbreit, Stickel, Schlottmann [Noyes, Wemyss, Conant], *etc.* [Schlottmann exhibits the connection as follows: "In ver. 4 Job says—'Granted that I have erred, you need give yourselves no concern about the matter.' In ver. 5 he adds—'If, nevertheless, you will concern yourselves about it, and in pride look down on me, it is at least incumbent on you not to assume without further proof that I have brought disgrace on myself by such an error, but to prove it against me with good arguments.' The repetition of אָמְנָם seems to cor-relate vers. 4 and 5, so that if, as all agree, the first and second members of ver. 4 are related to each other as protasis and apodosis, the same would seem to be true of ver. 5.—E.]

First Division: First Strophe. Vers. 6–12. Lamentation over his sufferings as proceeding from God.

Ver. 6. **Know then** (אֵפוֹ as in chap. ix. 24) ["elsewhere in questions, here strengthening the exclamation"—Schlott.] **that Eloah has wrested me,** *i. e.*, has treated me unjustly, done me wrong, עִוְּתָנִי for עִוֵּת מִשְׁפָּטִי, comp. chap. viii. 3; xxxiv. 12: Lam. iii. 36. **And compassed me round about with His net**—like a hunter who has entirely robbed a wild beast of its liberty by the meshes of the net which envelop him around, so that he can find no way of escape.—The expression describes the unforeseen and inexorable character of the dispensations which had burst on Job as the object of the Divine persecution; comp. Bildad's description, chap. xviii. 8 seq. ["Bildad had said that the wicked would be taken in his own snares. Job says that *God* had ensnared him." ELZAS.]

Ver. 7. **Lo! I cry—"Violence!"** (חָמָס as an interjectional exclamation, found also Hab. i. 2; comp. Jer. xx. 8) **and am not heard** (Prov. xxi. 13); **I call out for help, and there is no justice**—*i. e.*, no justice shown in an impartial examination and decision of my cause.—שִׁוַּע, lit. "to cry aloud for help, to send forth a cry for deliverance" (comp. Ps. xxx. 3 [2]; lxxii. 12; lxxxviii. 14 [13]), from שׁוּעַ, or שִׁוַּע = יָשַׁע, "to be wide, to be in a prosperous situation."

Ver. 8. **He has hedged up my way, that I cannot pass, and He has set darkness on my paths.**—Comp. chap. iii. 23; xiii. 27; also, as regards גָּדַר, "to fence up, to hedge up," Lam. iii. 7, 9; Hos. ii. 8 [6].

Ver. 9. **He has stripped me of mine honor;** *i. e.*, of my righteousness in the eyes of men; comp. ch. xxix. 14. The "crown of my head" in the parallel second member signifies the same thing; comp. Lam. v. 16. The same collocation of a "raiment of honor," and a "crown of the head," occurs also in Is. lxi. 10; lxii. 3; and suggested by these passages we find it often in evangelical church hymns [*e. g.*, in the following from WATTS:

"Then let my soul march boldly on,
Press forward to the heavenly gate,
There peace and joy eternal reign,
And *glittering robes* for conquerors wait.
There shall I wear a *starry crown*,
And triumph in Almighty grace,
While all the armies of the skies
Join in my glorious Leader's praise"].*

Ver. 10. **He breaks me down on every side:** like a building doomed to destruction, for such is the representation here given of Job's outward man together with his state of prosperity; comp. ch. xvi. 14; [**so that I pass away**], **and uproots like a tree, my hope:** *i. e.*, he takes entirely away from me the prospect of a restoration of my prosperity, leaves it no foundation or bottom, like a plant which is uprooted, and which for that reason inevitably withers (comp. ch. xiv. 19; xvii. 15). As to הִסִּיעַ, lit. "to tear out, to pluck up wholly out of the ground," comp. ch. iv. 21, where the object spoken of is the tent-stake.

* The above extract from Watts will supply for the English reader the place of the extract given by our author from P. GERHARD's hymn: "*Ein Lämmlein geht und trägt die Schuld.*"

Ver. 11. [**He makes His anger burn against me, and He regards me as His foes**], comp. ch. xiii. 24. The Imperfects alternating with Imperfects consecutive are, as above in ver. 10, and in what follows, used for *the present*, because present and continuous sufferings are described; comp. ch. xvi. 13, 14. [The plural in כְּצָרָיו, either for the class, of which Job is one; or, as Delitzsch suggests, "perhaps the expression is intentionally intensified here, in contrast with ch. xiii. 24; he, the one, is accounted by God as the host of His foes; He treats him as if all hostility to God were concentrated in him"].

Ver. 12. **Together all His troops advance.**—גְּדוּדִים, armies, synonymous with צָבָא, ch. x. 17, and denoting here, as there, the band of calamities, sufferings, and pains, which rush upon him.—**And cast up their way against me.**—יָסֹלּוּ, lit. "to heap up" their way, which is at the same time a rampart for carrying on the attack, a mound for offensive operations (סֹלְלָה, comp. 2 Sam. xx. 15; 2 Kings xix. 32; Ezek. iv. 2) against Job, who is here represented as a besieged fortress. In regard to this figure comp. above ch. xvi. 14; also in regard to the technics of siege operations among the ancient orientals, see Keil's *Bibl. Archäol.* § 159.

First Division: Second Strophe: Vers. 13–20. Lamentation over his sufferings as proceeding from man.

Ver. 13. **My brethren He drives far away from me:** to wit God, to whom here, precisely as in ch. xvii. 6, even the injustice proceeding from men is ascribed. For this reason the reading הִרְחִיק is perfectly in place, and it is unnecessary after the ἀπέστησαν of the LXX. to change it to הִרְחִיקוּ. To the term "brethren" (which as in Ps. lxix. 9 [8], is to be understood *literally*, not in the wider sense of relatives), who are described as turning away from him, corresponds in ver. 14 *a* the term קְרוֹבִים, "kinsmen" (Ps. xxxviii. 12 [11]). In like manner we find as parallel to the יֹדְעִים, *i. e.*, "knowers, confidants," in ver. 13 *b*, the מְיֻדָּעִים, *i. e.*, those familiarly known, intimate friends, in ver. 14 *b* (comp. in regard to it Ps. xxxi. 12 [11]; lxxxviii. 9 [8]. As synonyms in the wider sense there appear in the sequel גָּרֵי־בַיִת, "house-associates, or sojourners" in ver. 15 (Vulg., *inquilini domus meæ*) and finally מְתֵי־סוֹד (ver. 19), those who belong to the circle of closest intimacy, bosom-friends, (comp. ch. xxix. 4; Ps. lv. 15 [14]), so that the notion of friendship is here presented in six different phases and gradations, comp. on ch. xviii. 8-10.—As for the rest אַךְ זָרוּ ver. 13 *b* is lit., "are become *only* [or. *nothing but*] strange to me," *i. e.*, *entirely and altogether* strange; and חָדְלוּ, ver. 14 *a*, means "they cease," *i. e.*, to be friends, they leave off, fail (comp. ch. xiv. 7), withdraw from me.

Ver. 15. **My house associates** [= "they that dwell in mine house," E. V]. **and my maids** (this doubled expression denoting all the domestics, including hired servants and the like; comp. above) **are become strange to me**

[properly, "count me for a stranger," E. V.]. The verb תַּחְשְׁבֻנִי is governed as to gender by the subject next preceding: comp. Gesen. § 60; Ewald, § 339 *c* [Green, § 276, 1].

Ver. 16. **I call to my servant, and he answers not.**—Whether this disobedient servant is to be viewed as the overseer, or house-steward, like Eliezer in the house of Abraham, Gen. xxiv. (Del.), is in view of the simplicity of the language at least doubtful.—**With my mouth must I entreat him.**—For the Imperf. in the sense of *must*, comp. ch. xv. 30; xvii. 2. בְּמוֹ פִי (comp. Ps. lxxxix. 2 [1]; cix. 30), expresses here not, as in ch. xvi. 5, a contrast with that which proceeds out of the heart, but with a mere wink, or any dumb intimation of what might be desired of him.

Ver. 17. **My breath is offensive to my wife.**—זָרָה, from זוּר, to be strange, to be estranged, expresses simply by virtue of this signification the idea of "being repugnant, repulsive," so that we need not derive it from a particular verb זִיר, "to be loathsome;" and רוּחִי assuredly signifies here the *breath* (stinking according to *b*), having the same meaning as נַפְשִׁי in the partly parallel passage ch. vii. 15; hence not "my discontent" (Hirzel) ["my spirit, as agitated, querulous" Gesen.; "depression," Fürst]; nor "my sexual impulse" Arnh.; nor "my spirit" (Starke, [Carey] and ancient commentators); nor "my person" (Pesh., Umbreit, Hahn) [Renan].—Jerome already correctly: *halitum meum exhorruit uxor mea*, and in the same sense most of the moderns [so E. V.], **and my ill savor to the sons of my body.**—וְחַנֹּתִי, can neither signify: "my prayers, my entreaties" (Gesen., with a reference to his Gram., § 91, 3—against which however compare Ewald, § 259) [Noyes, Lee, Words., Elzas]; nor "my caresses (Arnh.) [Bernard, Rodw., Green, *Chrestom.*, and *Gram.* § 139, 2—Kal Inf. of חנן (with fem. termination ־ֹת) to be gracious]; nor "my lamentations, my groanings" (Hirzel, Vaih.) [Fürst]; nor yet finally—"and I pray to the sons of my body" (LXX., Vulg., Luth., *etc.*) [E. V., with different construction of the לְ—"though I entreated for the children's sake of my own body"]; for all these constructions are alike opposed to the language and to the context. The word is rather (with Schär., Rosen., Ew., Hahn, Schlott., Del., Dillm.), to be derived from the root חוּן, "to stink," which does not appear elsewhere indeed in Heb., but which is quite common in Arab. and Syr., and is to be construed either as first pers. sing. Perf. Kal ("and I smell offensively to the sons of my body"), or, which is better suited to the parallelism, as Infinitive substantive, זָרָה in *a* being still the predicate. This stench suggests in particular the fetid matter which issues from the festering and partially rotting limbs of the victim of elephantiasis. Comp. on ch. ii. 7; vii. 14.—That by "the sons of my body" (בְּנֵי בִטְנִי) we are not of necessity to understand the legitimate sons of Job, and hence that there is no contradiction between this passage and the prologue, has already been shown in the Introd., § 8, 3. We need not therefore follow the critics who are there refuted in deciding that the prologue is not genuine; nor assume (with Eichhorn and Olsh.) that the poet has here for once forgotten himself, and lost sight of his scheme as set forth in ch. i. 18, 19. We are rather to suppose (with Ewald, 1st Ed., Hirz., Heiligst., Hahn, Dillmann, *etc.*), that the reference is to *grandchildren*, the offspring left behind by the unfortunate sons—in favor of which may be cited the similar use of בָּנִים in a wider sense in Gen. xxix. 5; xxxi. 28, *etc.:* or else (with the LXX., Symmachus, J. D. Michaelis, Schär., Rosenm., Dathe, Ewald, 2d Ed.) *to his children by concubines* (υἱοὺς παλλακίδων μου, LXX.) a supposition however with which ch. xxxi. 1 seems scarcely to agree, however true it may be that in the patriarchal age, to which our poet assigns Job, rigid monogamistic views did not prevail. The explanation of Stuhlm., Gesen., Umbr., Schlott., Del., [Noyes, Conant, Elzas, Merx] is also linguistically possible, that בִּטְנִי stands for בֶּטֶן אִמִּי (after ch. iii. 10), so that בני בטני would mean accordingly Job's *natural brothers.* This theory however is inconsistent with the circumstance that Job has already made mention above, ver. 13, of his brothers; and that immediately following the mention of his wife, the mention of his descendants would be more suitable than that of his brothers. [To which add this from Bernard, that above, in ch. iii. 10, no ambiguity whatever could arise from the employment of בטני in the sense of "mother's womb," whereas "here, by using it in this sense, Job would have run such risk of having his meaning misunderstood, as בִּטְנִי might fairly be considered synonymous with חֲלָצַי, *my loins*, or מֵעַי, my bowels, that we find it quite impossible to believe that if he had really wished to speak here of his brethren, he would have applied to them such a very ambiguous epithet." It has also been suggested as a relief of the difficulty that children had been born to Job in the interval between the first series of calamities, and the infliction of the disease, but such a conjecture is too precarious. Others regard the expression as general. So Wordsworth: "He is speaking of the greatest wretchedness in general terms"].

Ver. 18. **Even youngsters act contemptuously towards me.**—עֲוִילִים, plur. of עֲוִיל, *puer* (root עוּל, comp. ch. xxi. 11) are little children, such namely as are rude and impudent mockers, like those children of Bethel, 2 Kings ii. 23 seq., which may be expressed by the word "youngsters" [Germ. "*Buben*": Bernard—"wicked-little-children"], here as also above in ch. xvi. 11.—It will also guard in particular against the mistake of supposing that Job's grandchildren are intended by these עוילים, (Hahn).—**If I rise up** (conditional clause, as in ch. xi. 17 [not as E. V., "I arose"]), **they speak about me**, make me the butt of jeering talk (דִּבֵּר בְּ, as in Ps. l. 20; Numb. xii. 1; xxi. 5).

Ver. 19. **My bosom friends abhor me:**—(comp. above on ver. 13 seq.), **and those whom**

I loved (זֶה relative, as in ch. xv. 17) **have turned against me.**—This verse points particularly at Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar, the once trusted friends, who are now become his violent opponents.

Ver. 20. **My bone cleaves to my skin and my flesh** (comp. ch. x. 11), *i. e.*, through my skin and my extremely emaciated flesh may be seen my bones, which seem to cleave, as it were, to that poor and loathsome integument. Comp. Lam. iv. 8: Ps. cii. 6 [5], **and I am escaped only with the skin of my teeth:**—*i. e.*, thus far only my gums (the flesh of my teeth, here called the skin of my teeth, because of their skinlike thinness and leanness of muscle) have been spared by this fearful disease,—so that I am able at least to speak, without having my mouth full of internal boils and sores (as is wont to be the case in the extreme stages of elephantiasis). This is the only satisfactory explanation, to which most moderns give in their adherence (Rosenm., Umbreit, Ewald, Hirzel, Vaih., Heil., Schlottm., Dillm.). This explanation of "the skin of the teeth" as the "gums," is undoubtedly the most obvious, simple, and natural. [Yet simpler, perhaps, is the view of Umbreit, Wordsworth, Noyes, Renan, Elzas, that it is a proverbial expression, describing a state in which one is stripped to the very minimum of possession, or emaciated to the last point. Wordsworth: "A proverbial paradox. I am reduced to a mere shadow, I am escaped with nothing, or next to nothing, so that my escape is hardly an escape. I am escaped with the skin of what has no skin, the skin of bone; comp. the Latin proverbs, *Lana caprina* (Horat., 1 Ep. xviii. 15), and *Totum nil* (Juvenal 3, 209)." To which may be added the humorous English proverb: "As fat as a hen in the forehead."—E.]. Other explanations are in part against the language, in part too artificial: such as *a*. That of Jerome, and many Catholic commentators, that by the skin of the teeth we are to understand the *lips*. *b*. That of Delitzsch, which explains it to mean particularly the periosteum (in distinction from the gums—as if such a distinction could have been known to the ancient Hebrews! [and "as though the poet had written for doctors!" Dillm.]).—*c*. That of Stickel and Hahn, who translate: "I am escaped with the nakedness of my teeth," [*i. e.*, with naked teeth].—*d*. That of Le Clerc, who understands it of the gums as alone remaining, when the teeth have fallen out.

5. *Second Division:* Vers. 21–27. A lofty flight to a blessed hope in God, his future Redeemer and Avenger, introduced by a pathetic appeal to the friends, that they would be mercifully disposed towards him, as one who had been so deeply humiliated, and so heavily smitten by the hand of God.

Ver. 21. ["Job here takes up a strain we have not heard previously. His natural strength becomes more and more feeble, and his tone weaker and weaker. It is a feeling of sadness that prevails in the preceding description of suffering, and now even stamps the address to the friends with a tone of importunate entreaty which shall, if possible, affect their hearts. They are indeed his friends, as the emphatic אַתֶּם רֵעָי affirms; impelled towards him by sympathy, they are come, and at least stand by him while all other men flee from him." Del. **Pity me, pity me** (pathetically repeated) **O ye my friends!**] **For the hand of Eloah hath touched me.**—An allusion to the nature of his frightful disease, being a species of leprosy, *i. e.*, of a נֶגַע (2 Ki. xv. 5), a *plaga Dei* ["wherefore the suffering Messiah also bears the significant name חִוָּרָא דְּבֵי רַבִּי, 'the leprous one from the school of Rabbi,' in the Talmud, after Isa. liii. 4, 8."]. One who is already treated with enough severity through the infliction of such a plague from God, ought not to be smitten also by men through the exercise of a merciless disposition, unfriendly words, *etc.*

Ver. 22. **Why do ye persecute me as God,** "by which he means not merely that they add their persecution to God's, but that they take upon themselves God's work, that they usurp to themselves a judicial divine authority; they act towards him as if they were superhuman, and therefore inhumanly." Del. **And are not satiated with my flesh?** *i. e.*, continually devour my flesh, figuratively speaking, by false accusations, slanders, suspicions of my innocence, *etc.*, gnaw me incessantly with the tooth of slander [comp. Engl. "backbiting"]. Comp. the equivalent figurative expression "slander" (*διαβάλλειν*) in the Aram. of the book of Daniel (ch. iii. 8; vi. 25) ["to eat the pieces of any one"], in the Syriac, where the devil is called *ochel-karso*=*διάβολος*, and in Arab. where "to eat the flesh or a piece of any one" is equivalent to "slandering, backbiting."

Ver. 23 seq. As though despairing of the possibility of influencing the friends to withdraw from their attacks on his innocence, he now turns with ardent longing for the final vindication of the same to God, first of all uttering the wish that his own asseverations of the same might be preserved to the latest generations. [Ewald imagines a pause after ver. 22. Job waits to see what response the friends would make to his pitiful appeal. They are silent, show no signs of relenting. Job sees that he has nothing to hope for either from men, or the God of the present. But in his extremity he obtains a glimpse of the far-distant future, after his death, which fills him with a new and wonderful courage]. **Oh that my words were but written** (מִי־יִתֵּן here followed by ו *consec.* before the voluntative [future], on account of the intervening אֵפוֹ, comp. Deut. v. 26), **that they were but inscribed** (יֻחָקוּ, pausal form for יֻחֲקוּ [see Ewald, ₰ 193, *c*, and Gesen., ₰ 67 (₰ 66) Rem. 8], Hoph. of חקק) **in a book!**—(בַּסֵּפֶר, with the Art., as this expression is always written—comp. Ex. xvii. 14; 1 Sam. x. 25, *etc.*—although no particular book is meant, but only in general a skin of an animal prepared for writing [ספר], a writing-roll). These words of his, which he thus desires to see transmitted for remembrance by after generations, are, as it is most natural to suppose, not those contained in ver. 25 seq., (Hahn, Schlottm.) [Scott, Good, Bernard, Words., Rodwell, Barnes], but the sufferer's former protestations of innocence, the assurances which from ch. vi. on he has conti-

nually put forth, that he suffers innocently. [In favor of this view, and against the other, Delitzsch argues: (1) It is improbable that the inscription would begin with ו.—(2) It is more likely that Job would wish to see inscribed that which was the expression of his habitual consciousness, than that which was but an occasional and transient flash of light through the darkness].

Ver. 24. **That with an iron pen** [**or style**] **and with lead**—*i. e.*, in letters engraved by means of an iron style, or chisel, and then filled in with lead, in order to make them more imperishable—**they might be graven in the rock forever!** Instead of לָעַד the LXX. read here, as also in Is. xxx. 8: לְעֵד, "for a witness, as testimony," (εἰς μαρτύριον), an emendation however which is unnecessary, for the rendering "forever" gives here a meaning that is quite suitable. The monumental inscription is indeed preferred to that on parchment just because of its greater durability, which is the reason why Job wishes for it here. In regard to the use of both methods of writing already in the Pre-Mosaic age, see Introd., § 2, No. 4, p. . [For accounts of such inscriptions see ROBINSON'S *Bibl. Researches in Palestine*, I., 169, 188 seq., 552; WILSON'S *Lands of the Bible*, I., 184 seq.; *Princeton Review*, 1870, page 533 seq. "This wish was not in truth too high on Job's part; for we now know sufficiently well that of old in those lands it was sought to perpetuate by means of inscriptions in stones and rocks not only short legal precepts, but also longer documents, memorable historical events, public requests, prayers, *etc.* Such costly works it is true could in general be completed only by kings and princes; Job was however a man of power in his age, who might well express such a wish." Ewald].

Ver. 25. Not because he despairs of the possibility of realizing this last wish (Dillm.), but because he knows for a certainty that God will not allow his testimony to his innocence to pass down to posterity without His absolute confirmations of it, and hence because he regards that wish for the eternal perpetuation of his testimony as by no means a vain one, he continues:—**And I know my Redeemer lives,** *etc.* The ו in ואני ידעתי is thus not used in an adversative sense (Luther, Ewald, Vaih., Dillm. [Conant, Noyes, Lee], *etc.*, but simply continuative, or, if one prefers it, ascensive, introducing the end to which the realization of the preceding wish is to lead. ["The progressive rendering seems to be preferable (to the adversative), because the human vindication after death, which is the object of the wish expressed in ver. 23 seq. is still not essentially different from the Divine vindication hoped for in ver. 25, which must not be regarded as an antithesis, but rather as a perfecting of the other, designed for posterity. Ver. 25 is, however, certainly a higher hope, to which the wish in ver. 23 seq. forms the stepping stone." Del.] The causal rendering (LXX., Vulgate, Stickel [E V., Good, Carey, Renan],) is less probable, although not altogether meaningless, as Dillmann affirms. [The rendering: "yea, verily," adopted by Schlottm., Words., Elzas, Merx, *etc.*, is probably designed to express the ascensive meaning referred to above.] Forasmuch as כִּי is wanting after ידעתי (as in ch. xxx. 23; Ps. ix. 21), we should translate simply in the *oratio directa:* "My Redeemer lives." גֹּאֵל, which according to ch. iii. 5 means literally "reclaimer, redeemer," acquires a meaning that is entirely too special, when it is taken by Umbreit and some others [Renan, Rodwell, Elzas] to be=גֹּאֵל הַדָּם, "the blood-avenger" (Num. xxxv. 12, 19), for the previous discourse was not of Job in the character of one murdered in his innocence, and ch. xvi. 18 is too remote. After the analogy of Prov. xxiii. 11; Lam. iii. 58; Ps. cxix. 154, we are to think in general of the restitution of the honor and right of one who has been oppressed, and are accordingly to take גֹּאֵל in the sense of a defender, an avenger of honor—a meaning indeed which approaches that of a "blood-avenger" in so far as the expected deliverance [or vindication] is conceived of as taking place only after the sufferer's death. For the Goel is חַי, is absolutely living (חַי, "he lives," incomparably stronger than יֵשׁ, for instance would have been) [חַי reminding us of "that name of God, חי עולם, Dan. xii. 7, after which the Jewish oath *per Anchialum* in Martial is to be explained," Del., and indicating here the contrast between Him, the Living One, and Job, the dying one, Dillm.], while the object of His redemptive activity is עָפָר, "dust," and as *b* shows, at the time when He arises, has long been dust.—**And as the Last will He arise upon the dust.**—אַחֲרוֹן cannot possibly with Böttcher and others [so E. V., Lee, Conant, Renan, Elzas] be construed in the adverbial sense "hereafter, in the latter time [or day]." It is clearly a substantive, used either in apposition to גֹּאֲלִי, the subj. of the first member, or as the independent subj. of the second member, identical in meaning with this גֹ׳. The word signifies neither "Next-man" [Next-of-kin, Ger. *Nachmann*] in the sense of Avenger (*vindex:* Ewald, Hirzel), nor the "Follower" [Germ. *Hintermann*, "backer"], "second" (Hahn), but according to Is. xliv. 6; xlviii. 12, simply the Last, he who survives all, an expression which is used here not with eschatological universality, but with particular reference to Job, who is no longer living (ch. xvii. 11 seq.). [Delitzsch, however, and in a way which seems more suitable to the sublimity and scope of the passage: "as the Last One, whose word shall avail in the ages of eternity, when the strife of human voices shall have long been silent."] Of this Last One, or this One who is hereafter to come, Job says: "He will stand up, He will arise" (יָקוּם), *viz.* for his protection and his deliverance (קוּם, the customary term for the favorable intervention of a judge to help one: Ps. xii. 6 [5]; Is. ii. 19, 21; xxxiii. 10, or also of a witness). He is thus to appear עַל־עָפָר, "upon the dust;"

i. e., according to ch. xvii. 16; xx. 11; xxi. 26, indisputably—on the dust to which I shall soon return (Gen. iii. 19; Eccles. iii. 20), or in which I shall soon be made to lie down, on the dust of my decayed body, or of my grave. This is the only meaning of the expression which suits the context (so Rosenm., Ewald, Vaih., Welte, Del., Dillmann [Conant, Elzas, Merx], *etc.*). Any other explanation does more or less violence to the language, whether with Umbreit we translate in a way altogether too classic, "in the arena;" or with Hahn, altogether too freely: "above the earth," *i. e.* in heaven! or with Jerome, Luther, and most of the ancients, altogether too dogmatically, and withal against the usage of the language, we find expressed an "awakening *out of the earth;*" or finally with Hirzel and others, we understand it in a way altogether too rationalistic of an "appearing of God *on the earth,*" in the sense of ch. xxxviii., rejecting any reference to the continuance of life hereafter [this last rendering, however, being adopted by not a few of the commentators who refer the passage to the final resurrection: so *e. g.* Scott, Lee]. In opposition to all these views, Dillmann says truly: "[Had Job intended here simply to express the hope of an appearance of God for the purpose of deciding the controversy in favor of Job, עַל־עָפָר would have been unnecessary (comp. *e. g.* Ps. xii. 6), and instead of יקום he would have said יֵרֵד rather, for it is not said elsewhere that God *arises on the dust* when He appears; besides that God does not appear in ch. xxxviii. on the earth, but He speaks His final decision out of the storm. Rather do] the words express the expectation of a גאל who lives, even when Job lives no longer, who comes after him, and who for the open vindication of his right arises on the dust in which he is laid, or stands above his grave." (Analogies from Arabic usage compel us thus to understand the phrase of the grave, or the dust of the grave; see Delitzsch.) "The words thus lead us without doubt into the circle of thought indicated in ch. xvi. 18 (although at the same time beyond the same). He does not yet say whom he intends by this גאל, because the main thought here is the certainty that such an one lives; not until ver. 26, after he has explained himself further, does he surprise the friends and himself by saying that the object of his hope is Eloah Himself."

Ver. 26. **And after my skin, which is broken in pieces, even this.**—אחר is not a conjunction belonging to נקפו, "after that" (Targ., de Dieu, Gesenius [Schlott., Con., Word., Rod.], *etc.*), but as its position immediately before עורי shows, a preposition [a prepos. when used as a conjunc. being always followed immediately by the verb; see ch. xlii. 7; Lev. xiv. 43. Rendered as a prepos. the meaning of the phrase "after my skin" will be "after the loss of it." Comp. ch. xxi. 21, אחריו, "after him," to wit, after his death]. נִקְּפוּ, however (which is not to be taken [with Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis* II., 2, 503] as a Chaldaizing variation of נִקְפּוֹת=an envelope, Germ. *Umspannung*), is an appositional relative clause, referring to עוֹרִי. It is found in the third plur. perf. Piel of נקף, "to break off" (in Piel used particularly of the hewing down of trees, Is. x. 34. Hence the third plur. here being used impersonally (comp. ch. iv. 19; vii. 3; xviii. 18), "after my skin, which is broken off," *i. e.* cut off piecemeal, mutilated, broken in pieces [E. V. unnecessarily supplies "worms" as subject]. The reference is to the skin together with the tender parts of the flesh [בַּדִּים] adhering to it, which gradually rot away, so that the meaning is similar to that of ch. xviii. 13. The זאת added at the end of this member of the verse cannot possibly be interpreted as equivalent to זאת תִּהְיֶה, "this shall be" (Targ., Gesen.) [for in that case זאת should have stood at the head of the clause]. We must either, with Arnheim, Stickel, Hahn, Delitzsch [Lee, Rodwell, and preferred by Green], explain it to mean "so, in this manner," connecting it in this sense adverbially with נִקְּפוּ "thus torn to pieces," Del.), or else explain it deictically, as pointing to the skin, or, since עוֹר is strictly masc., as pointing to the *body* as here represented by that term, the totality of Job's members and organs. [The distinction which the E. V. makes between the "skin" and the "body," the destruction of the latter being "after" that of the former seems not sufficiently warranted. Such a distinction must have been more clearly indicated. The construction is indeed a peculiar one, and yet exceedingly pathetic in its broken irregularity. "And after my skin—when it is all fallen off by decay—*this* tattered thing which you now see!" —E.] In respect to the various renderings of the ancients, especially those of the Targ., of Jerome, of Luther, *etc.*, see below [Doctrinal and Ethical] the history of the exposition of the passage.—**And free from my flesh, shall I behold Eloah.**—If מִבְּשָׂרִי be explained "out of my flesh" [or, as in this sense it is rendered by many, "in my flesh," either referring it to his resurrection-body, E. V., Good, Lee, *etc.;* or] with a reference to the restored body of the sufferer (Eichh. v. Cölln, Knapp, Hofmann) [Noyes, Wemyss, Elz., Rod., who render by "in"], it would form an inappropriate antithesis to עוֹרִי in *a*, which would be all the more strange, seeing that only a little before, in ver. 20, they had been used as in substance synonymous. Neither can the expression signify exactly "from behind, or within my flesh" (against Volck); this meaning would require בְּעַד, or מִבַּעַד (after Cant. iv. 1, 3; vi. 7). Hence מִן is to be rendered privatively, "away from, without, free from" (comp. ch. xi. 15; xxi. 9). In that case, however, the reference is not to the last point of time in Job's earthly life, when he would be relieved of all his flesh, *i. e.*, would be completely reduced to a skeleton (Chrysost., Umbr., Hirz., Stickel, Heiligst., Hahn, Renan, *etc.*), but to his condition after departing from this earth, a condition which if not absolutely incorporeal, is at least one of freedom from the body. It refers to the time when, freed from his

suffering, miserable, decayed σάρξ, he shall behold God as a glorified spirit (Ewald, Vaihinger, Schlottm., Arnheim, Delitzsch, Dillmann [Con., Green]). This latter interpretation is favored decidedly by the Imperf. אֶחֱזֶה, which is not to be rendered in the present (as by Mercier, Hahn, H. Schultz [*Bibl. Theol. des A. T.*, Vol. II., 1870], *etc.*): "I behold God even now in the spirit;" for then the circumstantial particulars, אַחַר עוֹרִי and מִבְּשָׂרִי, would appear meaningless, and almost unintelligible, but which is certainly to be construed in the *future*, expressing the hope in a joyful beholding of God hereafter, (comp. the similar meaning of אחזה in Ps. xvii. 15, also of יֶחֱזוּ in Ps. xi. 7), that is to say, as the following verse shows yet more clearly, in such a beholding of God in a glorified state after death (Matth. v. 8; 1 John iii. 2, *etc*). The expression of such a hope here "does not, after ch. xiv. 13-15; xvi. 18-21, come unexpectedly; and it is entirely in accordance with the inner progress of the drama, that the thought of a redemption from Hades, expressed in the former passage, and the demand expressed in the latter passage for the rescue of the honor of his blood, which is even now guaranteed him by his witness in heaven, are here united together into the confident assurance that his blood and his dust will not be declared by God the Redeemer as innocent, without his being in some way conscious of it, though freed from this his decaying body." (Delitzsch).

Ver. 27 describes, in triumphant anticipation of the thing hoped for, how Job will then behold God. **Whom I shall behold for myself**, to wit, for my salvation; the לִי, "for me" (emphatic *Dat. commodi*, as in Ps. lvi. 10; cxviii. 6) being decidedly emphasized, as also אֲנִי, "I," by the use of which Job makes prominent the thought that he, who was so grievously persecuted, and delivered over to certain death, was destined some day to enjoy a blessed beholding of God. **And whom mine eyes shall see, and not a stranger.**—רָאוּ after the Fut. אֶחֱזֶה is the Perf. of certainty, or of futurity (*præt. propheticum s. confidentiæ*), and וְלֹא־זָר, can only be nominative, synonymous with וְלֹא אַחֵר (*et non alius*, Vulg.; so also LXX., Targ. [E. V.], and most). not accusative, as held by Gesenius in Thes., Vaih., Umbreit, Stickel. Hahn, v. Hofm. [Noyes, Wemyss, Carey, Elzas, Green], who take the rendering which they assume, *et non alium*, in the sense of *et non adversarium*, "and not as an enemy"—which is decidedly at variance with the universal use of זָר, which never signifies "an enemy" [never at least except indirectly, and in a national connection, a hostile alien: it can scarcely be regarded as the word which Job would most naturally use in describing God's personal relations to himself,—E.], and also at variance with the clause וְעֵינַי רָאוּ, which ought not to stand without an object, if ולא־זר were an appositional accusative. It is undoubtedly to be taken as a nominative [in cor-relation to אֲנִי and עֵינַי, "*I—my* eyes"] "and not a stranger, not another" (with which comp. Prov. xxvii. 2), containing an allusion to Job's three opponents, who could *not* share in this future joyful beholding of God the Vindicator, at least not in the same blessed experience of it as himself. Moreover the very fact that Job here so obviously glances aside at his opponents, with their hostile disposition, precludes the supposition of Hirzel and others, who put the time of the beholding here prophesied in this life, and regard ch. xxxviii. 1 seq. as the fulfillment of the prophecy; for comp. ch. xlii. 7 seq. [Zöckler's argument seems to be that the vindication recorded at the close of the book could not be the vindication here anticipated by Job for the reason that in the former case God did really appear to the friends, as well as to Job, whereas they were to be excluded (so also Delitzsch) from the appearance to which Job looked forward. But it is unnatural to suppose that the Theophany and the Vindication in which Job here exults, would be limited either to himself or to his sympathizing adherents. The very object of it presupposes the presence, as witnesses, of those who had wronged him. When Job accordingly says: "*I* shall see Him—*my* eyes shall behold Him—and not a stranger"—he is not so much *intimating* that *they* would be excluded, as *denying* that *he himself* would be excluded. The vindication was not to be in his own absence, and before a stranger, who would feel no interest in the matter, but—in some strange, unaccountable way—*he* would be there, participating in the awful glory and the blessed triumph of the scene. This view of the meaning also gives the most satisfactory explanation of זָר, not an "enemy," as shown above, which would be inappropriate, nor "another," which would be too general, but a "stranger," who would have no interest in the result. The jubilant tone of Job's mind is strikingly exhibited in the repetition of the pronoun: "*I*—for *me*—*my* eyes," the climax being reached in וְלֹא־זָר.—E.]—Finally, the fact that Job here hopefully promises this future beholding of God not only to himself as the personal subject, but in particular to his *eyes*, may certainly with perfectly good right be appealed to in proof that the condition in which he hopes to enjoy it, *viz.* disembodied, freed from the earthly בשר, is to be understood not as one of abstract incorporeality, or absolute spirituality—for this is a representation which is decidedly opposed to the concrete pneumatico-realistic mode of thought found in the Old Testament Scriptures, which does not even represent God as abstractly incorporeal — **My reins pine** (therefore) **in my bosom:** *viz.* with longing for such a view. כָּלוּ, lit. "they are consumed, waste away, languish; elsewhere used of the soul pining away with longing (Ps. lxxxiv 3 [2]; cxix. 81), or of the eyes (Ps. lxix. 4 [3]; cxix. 123; comp. above ch. xi. 20; xvii. 5), here of that inner organ which is regarded as the seat of the tenderest, inmost and deepest affections, being used also in this sense in Ps. xvi. 7; vii. 10 [9] (Del., *Biblical Psychology*, p 268 [Clark, p. 317]). Comp. also the Arabic phrase *culaja tadhûbu*,

"my reins melt." Essentially the same meaning is given to the phrase in the various renderings which on other accounts are objectionable, *e. g.* the Syriac: "my reins waste away completely by reason of my lot;" that of Hahn: "if my reins perish in my bosom." [E. V. and Good: "though my reins be consumed within me;" Lee and Conant: "when my reins are (or shall have been) consumed within me;" either of which renderings is far less expressive as limiting the description to Job's physical sufferings, now, or in death, and failing to bring out the pathetic emotion with which the passage expresses Job's ardent *longing* for the day of his vindication—a meaning which is not only far more in accordance with the general usage of the words (see reff. above), but also most touchingly appropriate here. As Dillmann also remarks: "These words indicate that what Job has said just before expresses something altogether extraordinary."—E.]

6. *Third Division: Conclusion:* Earnestly warning the friends against the further continuance of their attacks: vers 28, 29. [It is worthy of note how lofty the tone which Job inspired by the vision of his future vindication, here assumes towards the friends. No longer a suppliant for pity (ver. 21), or trembling before their threats of the Divine vengeance, he now threatens *them* with that vengeance in case they persevere in their unjust treatment of him. —E.]

Ver. 28. **If ye think** [lit. **say**] **How will we pursue him!**—כִּי is neither causal (Stick.) [Rodwell], nor affirmative, "truly" (Umbreit, Hirzel, Vaih.), [nor adversative "but" (E. V.), which requires an untenable rendering of the clauses which follow; nor temporal—"then" (Wemyss, Renan, Elzas, who refer it to Job's restoration in this life; Good and Lee, who refer it to the resurrection), for this is inconsistent with the future נִרְדָּף]; but, as the analogy of ch xxi. 28 teaches, a conditional particle "if" ["when" Ewald; "since," Noyes], so that ver. 28 is the protasis of which ver. 29 is the apodosis. מַה in that case is neither an interrogative "how?" (Böttcher) [Carey], nor "why?" (Umbreit, Hirzel [E. V., Rodmann, Elz.], *etc.*), but exclamatory: "how! how much!" comp. ch. xxvi. 2, 3; Cant. vii. 2.—In regard to the construction of רדף with לְ, found only here, comp. that with אֶל in Judg. vii. 25. With this exclamation of the friends there is connected in *b* the expression of an opinion, or a thought on their part in the *oratio obliqua:* **and** (if you think): **the root of the matter is found in me,** *i. e.* the cause of my suffering lies only in me, *viz.* in my sin. As regards this connection of an *oratio obliqua* with an *oratio recta*, especially with exclamatory clauses, comp. chap. xxii 17; xxxv. 3; Ewald, § 338. According to the reading of the ancient versions (LXX., Targ., Vulg.), and of some MSS., which have בּוֹ instead of בִּי, this interchange of the direct and conditional form of expression is removed, assuredly against the original construction. [According to another view, followed by the translators of the E. V., "the root of the matter" is to be taken in a good sense of Job's piety (Barnes), or the "justice of his cause" (Renan). The expression has indeed become in English a proverbial one for religious sincerity, and we who have become accustomed to it in this sense may find a little difficulty in releasing our minds from the power of that association It will be found difficult, however, to harmonize such a thought with the connection. In the E. V., for example, no one can help feeling that the connection between ver. 28 and the preceding passage has an unsatisfactory abruptness and lameness about it, and even this connection, such as it is, rests on a forced rendering of כִּי which is properly adversative only after an expressed or implied negative. And in general it may be said, that whether we regard ver. 28 *b* as a declaration of Job's sincerity by himself or by his friends, it will be found next to impossible to put it into proper and natural relations to ver 28 *a* on the one hand, and to ver. 29 on the other. The most intelligible, tenable and forcible construction is that given above by Zöckler (and adopted by Ewald, Dillmann, Schlottmann, Delitzsch, Conant, Green), which regards vers. 28, 29 as a lofty warning to the friends, inspired by the triumphant anticipation of vers. 25–27, bidding them—if they continued to persecute him, and to charge him with harboring within himself the root of the calamities which had befallen him—to beware of the sword!—E.]

Ver. 29. Apodosis: **Be ye afraid** (לָכֶם "for yourselves," as in Hos. x. 5) **before the sword,** *i. e.* the avenging sword of God; comp. חֶרֶב in ch. xv. 22; xxvii. 14; Deut. xxxii. 41; Zech. xiii. 7, *etc.* ["a sword, without the *art.* in order to combine the idea of what is boundless, endless and terrific with the indefinite," Del.]. This sufficiently distinct threat of Divine punishment is confirmed by that which follows: **for wrath** (befalls) **the transgressions of the sword, that ye may know that** (there is) **a judgment.**—חֵמָה, "glow of wrath, rage," can scarcely be regarded as the subject, with the meaning: "for wrath (against friends) is one of the crimes of the sword" (Schultens, Stickel, Schlottmann), [Conant, Noyes, who with less than his usual accuracy renders by "malice"]. Apart from the difficulty that עֲוֹנוֹת can by no means, without modification be =the partitive מֵעֲוֹנוֹת, the meaning is not at all suited to the true position of Job as regards the friends, who might rather reproach *him* with anger, than he them. Rather is חֵמָה a noun in the predicate, the meaning being: "wrath are the sword's crimes," *i. e.* they carry wrath as a reward in themselves, they cause wrath, they are infallibly overtaken by it (Rosenm., Hahn, Delitzsch, Dillmann, *etc.*). ["Crimes of the sword are not such as are committed with the sword—for such are not treated of here, and, with Arnh. and Hahn, to understand חֶרֶב of the sword of 'hostilely mocking words' is arbitrary and artificial—but such as have incurred the sword. Job thinks of slanders and blasphemy." Delitzsch]. This explanation is better than that of Hirzel, Ewald [Rodwell], *etc.*;

"for wrath, *i. e.* something to be dreaded, are the punishments of the sword," for עֲוֹנוֹת can scarcely be taken in the sense of punishments, chastisements; even in Ps. xxxi. 11; xxxviii. 5; Lam. iv. 6, עָוֹן signifies not so much punishment, as rather evil-doing, sin together with its mischievous consequences. The above interpretation is not, it is true, altogether satisfactory; nevertheless, if we should attempt to amend the passage, it would be better to introduce a ל before עֲוֹנוֹת, than either to change חֵמָה to הֵמָּה (Gesenius: "for *such*, *i. e.* such transgressions as yours, are crimes of the sword) or to introduce the constr. state חֲמַת before עֲוֹנוֹת, which is the construction given by the Pesh. and Vulg., the latter of which reads: *quoniam ultor iniquitatum gladius est.* A difficulty is also presented in the word שַׁדִּין (K'thibh) or שַׁדּוּן (K'ri) at the end of the last member, occasioned by the fact that שֶׁ=אֲשֶׁר does not elsewhere occur in the Book of Job, as also by the fact that the rendering of the LXX.—*ποῦ ἔστιν αὐτῶν ἡ ὕλη* (or according to the Cod. Alex. *ὅτι οὐδαμοῦ αὐτῶν ἡ ἰσχύς ἐστιν*) probably points to another text in the original. The above rendering, however: "that ye may know that there is a judgment," is in general accord with the context, and corresponds well to the meaning of these closing verses. It is not necessary with Heiligst., Dillmann, Ewald (2d Ed.), to read שַׁדַּי: "that ye may know the Almighty;" nor (which is moreover linguistically inadmissible) to regard שַׁדִּין as a variation of שַׁדַּי (Eichhorn, Hahn, Ewald, 1st Ed.), which would yield the same meaning. ["דִּין has everywhere else the signification *judicium*, *e. g.* by Elihu, ch. xxxvi. 17; and also often in the Book of Proverbs, *e. g.* ch. xx. 8 (comp. in the Arabizing supplement, ch. xxxi. 8). The final judgment is in Aramaic דִּינָא רַבָּא; the last day in Heb. and Arabic, יוֹם הַדִּין, *jaum ed-din.* To give to שדין, "that (there is) a judgment," this dogmatically definite meaning, is indeed, from its connection with the historical recognition of the plan of redemption, inadmissible; but there is nothing against understanding the conclusion of Job's speech according to the conclusion of the Book of Ecclesiastes, which belongs to the same age of literature." Delitzsch.]

["Thus does this lofty tragical discourse combine in itself the deepest humiliation and depression with the highest Divine elevation, the most utter despair with the most animated overflowing hope and the most blissful certainty. Not only does it occupy the lofty centre of the human controversy and of the whole action, but it also causes the first real and decisive revolution in Job's favor, because in it Job's two ruling thoughts and tendencies, the unbelief springing from superstition, and the higher genuine faith just forming itself come into such sharp and happy contact that the latter rushes forth out of its insignificance with irresistible might, and although the discord is not as yet harmonized, from this time on it maintains itself, gradually prevails more and more, until at last it remains supreme and alone." Ewald.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The history of the interpretation of vers. 25–27, the passage of greatest theological importance in this chapter, exhibits three principal views of the meaning. Of these the two oldest rest on the texts of the ancient versions, and particularly of the LXX. and Vulg., which are more or less erroneous, and yield results which are one-sided and partially perverted. It is only the latest of these which, resting on the original text, avoids these one-sided results, and sets forth the poet's thought with unprejudiced objectivity.

a. A *rigidly orthodox*, or if the phrase be preferred, an *ultra-orthodox* (ultra-eschatological) view, which can be traced back into the earliest periods of the church, assumes that the passage predicts *a resuscitation of the body by Christ on the last day.* This assumption rests on the rendering of ver. 25 *b*, and ver. 26 *a* by the LXX., partly indeed also on the Targum, but more especially on the rendering of the passage in the Vulgate—a rendering which flows out of the older version, and which pushes still further its misinterpretation. The LXX presents a version of the words which for the most part indeed is opposed, rather than otherwise, to the eschatological view, which limits Job's expectations to the present earthly life, which in fact almost wholly precludes the reference to the future. But the words beginning with יקום, ver 25 *b*, (instead of which it read יָקִים), and ending with זאת, ver. 26 *a*, which it combines together so as to form *one* sentence, it renders thus: *ἀναστήσει δέ μου τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἀναντλοῦν μοι ταῦτα* (Cod. Alex.: *ἀναστῆσαι μου τὸ δέρμα μου τὸ ἀναντλοῦν ταῦτα*). According to this rendering a future resuscitation *after death* of the sorely afflicted body of Job is as distinctly as possible expressed. The Targumist expresses essentially the same meaning: "I know that my Redeemer lives," and hereafter my redemption will arise (*i. e.* be made actual, become a reality) over the dust, and after that my skin is again made whole (or —according to another reading—"is swollen up") this will happen, and out of my flesh shall I behold God. On the basis of these interpretations, which were rooted in the hopes of a resurrection cherished by the Jews after the exile, and especially on the basis of the former [that of the LXX.], Clemens Romanus (1 Cor. 26), Origen (Comm. in Matth. xxii. 23 seq.), Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. XVIII.), Ephraem, Epiphanius (Orat. Ancorat), and other fathers before Jerome, found in the passages a proof of the church doctrine of the *ἀνάστασις τῆς σαρκός.* Still more definitely and completely did the passage acquire the character of a Scriptural proof of this doctrine from *Jerome*, as the author of the authorized Latin translation, which was adopted by the Western Church during the Middle Ages, as well as by the Catholic Church of recent times. While the predecessor of his work, the Itala, had somewhat indefinitely expressed a meaning approximating that of the LXX. ("*super terram resurget cutis mea*," etc.), the Vulgate

set aside the last remnant of a possibility that the passage should be understood of a restitution or a restoration of Job in this life. This it did by introducing into the text of vers. 25 and 26 three inaccuracies of the most glaring sort. For יָקוּם (or יָקִים) it substituted without more ado אָקוּם, *surrecturus sum;* אַחֲרוֹן it rendered, *in novissimo die!* and rendering נִקְּפוּ as Niphal of נקף = קוף, "to surround, to circle," it gave to it no less arbitrarily the meaning of *circumdabor*, so that the whole passage is made to read thus: ver. 25: "*scio enim, quod redemptor meus vivit et in novissimo die de terra surrecturus sum;* ver. 26: *et rursum circumdabor pelle mea et in carne mea videbo Deum meum;* ver. 27: *quem visurus sum ego ipse et oculi mei conspecturi sunt et non alius; reposita est hæc spes mea in sinu meo.*"—This interpretation, which was emphatically approved and recommended by Augustine (*De Civ. Dei* XXII., 29), held its ground through the Middle Ages among all Christian expositors, and all the more necessarily that a revision of the same after the Hebrew could not be undertaken by any one of them. Neither does Luther's translation—"But I know that my Redeemer liveth, and *He will hereafter raise* [or *quicken*] *me out of the earth, and I shall thereupon be surrounded with this my skin*, and shall see God *in my flesh*"—break through the spell of this doctrinally prejudiced interpretation; and just as little as Luther do the distinguished Reformed translators of the Bible, *e. g.*, Leo Juda, Joh. Piscator, the authors of the English Version, *etc.*, exhibit any substantial departure from the meaning or phraseology of the Vulgate. Thus the rendering under consideration succeeded in acquiring the most important influence even in the evangelical theological tradition. It came to be cited in Church symbols (*e. g.*, Form Conc. Epit., p. 375 R.) [Westminster Conf. of Faith XXXII. 2], catechisms and doctrinal manuals as a cardinal proof-text for the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and occasionally even for the divinity of Christ (on account of the אֱלוֹהַּ of ver. 26). It became a leading theme of sacred poets (*e. g.*, of Louisa Henrietta v. Brandenburg, who wrote "Jesus, meine Zuversicht" [Jesus, my Trust], of P. Gerhard, the author of "Ich weiss dass mein Erlöser lebt" [of Charles Wesley: "I know that my Redeemer lives"]), and in general it has received the most manifold application alike in the domain of speculative theology, and in that of practical and ascetic piety. Even such thorough exegetes as Cocceius, Seb. Schmidt, Starke, while in subordinate details occasionally departing from the traditional ecclesiastical version, advocate strenuously the direct christological and eschatological reference of the passage (comp. also Jablonsky, *De Redemptore stante super pulverem*, Francof. ad V. 1772: Gude and Rambach: *De Jobo Christi incarnationis vate*, Halæ 1730, *etc.*). A number even of able Orientalists, and independent Hebrew scholars since the last century, such as Schultens, J. H. and J. D. Michaelis, Velthusen, Rosenmüller, Rosengarten, the English writers Mason, Good, Hales, J. Pye Smith [Scott, Lee, Carey, Wordsworth],* and quite recently the Catholic Welte, think that notwithstanding the various amendments which following the original text they make to the version of the Vulg., or in a measure to that of Luther, the passage must still be held to teach, at least in general, the Church doctrine of the resurrection, in that they favor the inadmissible rendering of וְלֹא־זָר as = *neque ego alius* ("and truly I not as another, I as unchanged"), or understand "the appearing of the Redeemer on the dust" as having for its object the quickening of the dead, and hence as referring to the Second Advent of Christ, or find denoted in מִבְּשָׂרִי the glorified flesh of the resurrection body, or adopt other explanations of a like character (against which see above in the Exegetical and Critical Remarks).

b. A one-sided *anti-eschatological* view which limits the object of Job's hope and longing wholly to this life, which may also be called *the skeptical* or *hypercritical rationalistic* view has for its precursors in the Ancient Church Chrysostom, John of Damascus, and other fathers of the Oriental Church. By an allegorizing interpretation of the language of the LXX. ἀναστήσει δέ μου τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἀναντλοῦν μοι ταῦτα, these writers refine away the eschatological meaning which undoubtedly belongs to the passage as pointing to the hereafter, and refer it to the removal of his disease which Job hoped for, and the rehabilitation of his disfigured body; and they saw that the phraseology of the Septuagint in the remaining verses of the passage favored this interpretation. Most of the Jewish Exegetes during the Middle Ages adhered to their view so far as the principle was concerned, the principle, to wit, of excluding from the passage any messianic and eschatological application while in respect to many of the details they hit upon novel expedients, which were in part of a most wonderful and arbitrary character. The more freely inclined theologians of the Reformed Churches also, such as Mercier, Grotius, Le Clerc, substantially adopted this view. After the time of Eichhorn (*Allg. Biblioth der Bibl. Literatur* I. 3, 1787) it acquired even a temporary ascendency over the opposite opinions, and that not only with commentators of rationalistic tendencies, such as Justi, v. Cölln, Knobel, Hirzel, Stickel, *etc.*, but even with supra-naturalists, such as Dathe, Döderlein, Baumgarten-Crusius, Knapp, Augusti, Umbreit, and even with Hahn, strictly orthodox as he is elsewhere (*De spe immortalitatis sub V. T. gradatim exculta*, 1845, and his Comm. on the passage), with v. Hofmann (concerning whose peculiar rendering of נִקְּפוּ see above on ver. 26), with the English theologians Wemyss, Stuart, Barnes [Warburton, Divine Legation, Book VI., Sec. 2; Patrick, Kennicott, Noyes, Rodwell; to whom may be added Elzas and Bernard], and others. Almost all the advocates of this view agree in holding

* [Among other prominent English theological writers who interpret the passage of Christ and the final resurrection, may be mentioned Owen, Vol. XII., Stand. Lib. of Brit. Divines, p. 508 seq.; Bp. Andrews' Sermons, Vol II., p. 251 seq. in Lib. of Ang.-Cath. Theol.; Bp. Sherlock, Works 1830, Vol. II, p. 167 seq.; John Newton, Works, Vol. IV., p. 435 seq.; Bp. Pearson on the Creed, Art. XI.; Dr. W. H. Mill, Lent Sermons, Cambridge, 1845; Dr. W. L. Alexander, Connec. and Harm. of O. and N. Tests., p. 153 seq.—E.]

that in ver. 25 seq. Job, having just before expressed the wish that he might see his protestation of innocence perpetuated, utters his conviction that such a perpetuation for posterity would not be necessary, that he himself would yet live to see the restoration of his honor and of his health, and that even though he should waste away to a most pitiful skeleton, he would be made to rejoice by the appearance of God to benefit him and none others.

c. An *intermediate* view, or one exhibiting a *moderate eschatology*, which resting on the most exact philological and impartial treatment of the original text, avoids the one-sided conclusions of the two older interpretations, has been advanced and defended by Ewald (*Die Dichter des Alten Bundes*, 1st Ed., Vol. III., 1836), and substantially adopted by Vaihinger, Schlottman, v. Gerlach, Hupfeld (*Deutsche Zeitschrift*, 1850, No. 35 seq.), Oehler (*Grundzüge der alt-testamentlichen Weisheit*, 1854), König (*Die Unsterblichkeitsidee im B. Job*, 1855, Hoelemann (*Sächs. Kirchen—, und Schulbl.* 1853, No. 48 seq.), Del. (Art. Job in Herzog's Real-Encycl., and in his Commentary), Dillmann, Davidson (Introduction II. 224 seq.) [Conant, Canon Cook in Smith's Bib. Dict. Art. "Job;" MacClintock & Strong's Cyclop. Art. "Job"], and even by the Jewish expositors Arnheim and Löwenthal. According to the unanimous opinion of these investigators, Job here expresses the hope, not indeed of a bodily resuscitation from death, but nevertheless of a future beholding of God in a spiritual glorified state. It is not the hope of a resurrection; it is, however, the hope of immortality, to which he is here lifted up, and that too with great clearness and the most vivid definiteness, above the ordinary popular conception of the ancient Israelites, as it has been previously declared even by himself.

2. We have, in our Exegetical Remarks above, expressed our concurrence in this modified eschatological or futuristic exposition of the passage, because, on the one side, the unmodified doctrinal orthodox rendering presents too many linguistic errors and arbitrary constructions to have any scientific value whatever attached to it, and because on the other side the view which excludes every reference to the hereafter can be established only by allegorically or rationalistically refining away the obvious phraseology of the passage. The latter interpretation, which Hirzel in particular has attempted to support with great argumentative acuteness, cannot be successfully maintained.

a. The connection with vers. 23, 24 cannot be urged in its favor, for Job by no means contradicts the wish here expressed that the protestation of his innocence might be preserved for posterity, when in ver. 25 seq. he declares the assurance of his triumphant justification by God hereafter; rather in proclaiming this assurance he but takes a new step upward in the inspired conviction that God will at last interpose as the Avenger of his innocence.

b. Job's former hopelessness, as he contemplates the mournful lot of him who goes down into Sheol, cannot be used as an argument in favor of that view; for Job's former discourses are by no means wanting in *preparatory intimations* of a clear and well-defined hope in future retribution and a blessed immortality: see especially ch. xiv. 13–15, and ch. xvi. 18–21.

c. Nor finally can the fact that neither by Job's friends, nor in the historical issue of the colloquy in the Epilogue is there any direct reference made to this expression of Job's hope of immortality, be urged against our interpretation; for "it is a general characteristic of all the discourses of the friends, that they—spellbound as they are within the circle of their external, legal views—scarcely enter at all in detail upon the contents of Job's discourses; and in ch. xxxviii. seq. God does not undertake the task of a critic, who passes judgment, one by one, on all the propositions of the contending parties. That the poet, however, should have framed for the drama a different issue from that which it has, is not to be desired, for the theme of the poem is not the question touching the immortality of man's spirit, but the question: how is the suffering of the righteous to be harmonized with the Divine justice" (Dillmann)? Such a change of the issue, moreover, would be undesirable for the reason that *the very contrast between the deliverance and exaltation which Job here hopes for as something which lies after death, and the favor which God visits upon him even in this life, a favor infinitely surpassing all that he hopes and waits for, prays for or understands—this is one of the most striking beauties of the poem, constitutes indeed the real focus of its splendor and its crowning close* (comp. v. Gerlach in the Homiletical Remarks on ver. 25 seq.). Such a sudden unexpected blazing up of the bright light of the hope of immortality, without frequent references to it afterwards, and without other preparations or antecedent steps leading to it than a wish (in ch. xiv. 13 seq.), and a demand of similar meaning (ch. xvi. 18 seq.)—corresponds perfectly to the style of our poet, who, having assigned his hero to the patriarchal age, does not ascribe to him his own settled certainty of faith, representing him as possessing such a certainty in the same clear, complete measure as himself; he aims rather to represent him as striving after such a possession. To this it may be added that Hirzel's view, which places the object of the sufferer's hope altogether in this life is contradicted by the fact that Job in what he has already said has repeatedly described his end as near, his strength as completely broken, his disease as wholly incurable, his hope of an *earthly* restoration of his prosperity as having altogether disappeared (ch. vi. 8-14; vii. 6; xiii. 13-15; xiv. 17-22; xvii. 11-16). With such extreme hopelessness, how would it be possible to reconcile the expression in ver. 25 seq. of the very opposite, as is assumed to be the case by the interpretation which refers that passage to this life? And why again hereafter, in ch. xxx. 23, does the gloomy outlook of a near and certain death find renewed expression in a way which cuts off all possibility of cherishing any hopes in regard to this life (see on the passage)? Wherefore such an unseemly wavering between the solemnly emphasized certainty of the hope in an appearance of Eloah, and the not less emphatic expression of the certainty that he

has no hope in such an appearance? What would the artistic plan of the poem in general gain by allowing the hero in the middle of it to predict the final issue, but afterwards to assume, even as he had already done before, that the exact opposite of this is the only possible issue?

3. Seeing then that every consideration favors most decidedly the view which interprets the passage in accordance with a moderate eschatology, the question still remains: *whether that beholding of God after this earthly life*, which Job here anticipates as taking place concurrently with the vindication of his honor and his redemption, *is conceived of by him as something that is to be realized in the sphere of abstract spirituality, or whether his conception of it is more concrete, realistic, in analogy with the relations of this earthly life?* In other words, the question is: whether his idea of immortality is *abstractly spiritualistic*, or *one which up to a certain point approximates the New Testament doctrine of a resurrection?* We have already declared above (on ver. 27 *b*) in favor of the latter opinion; because (1) The mention of the eyes with which he expects to see God admits only of that pneumatico-realistic meaning, under the influence of which the Old Testament speaks even of eyes, ears, and other bodily organs as belonging to God, and in general furnishes solid supports to the proposition of Oetinger touching corporeity as the "end of the ways of God." To this it may be added that (2) the absolute incorporealness of Job's condition after death is in no wise expressed by the phrase מִבְּשָׂרִי, notwithstanding the privative meaning which in any case belongs to מִן, that this expression merely indicates the object of Job's hope to be a release from his present miserable body *of flesh*, and that accordingly what Job here anticipates is (gradually accomplished to be sure, but) not specifically different from that which the Apostle calls *τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν* (Rom. viii. 23; comp. ch. vii. 25), or what on another occasion he expresses in more negative form by the proposition: *ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν Θεοῦ κληρονομῆσαι οὐ δύνανται οὐδὲ ἡ φθορὰ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν κληρονομεῖ* (1 Cor. xv. 50).—Still further (3) the concluding verse of ch. xiv. shows that Job conceives even of man's condition in Sheol as by no means one of abstract incorporeality, but rather invests this gloomy and mournful stage of his existence after death with two factors of being (בשׂר and נפשׁ), conceiving of them as existing in conjunction, and as standing in some kind of a relation to each other (see above on the passage). Finally (4): The perfected realistic hopes of a resurrection, found in the later Old Testament literature from the time of Ezekiel and Daniel on, would be absolutely inconceivable, they would be found drifting in the air without attachment or support, they would be without all historical precedent, if in the passage before us the hope of immortality be understood in the light of an abstract spirituality. What Job says here is certainly nothing more than a germ of the more complete resurrection creed of a later time, but it must indubitably be regarded as such a germ, as such a seminal anticipation of that which the Israel of a later period believed and expected in respect to the future state. Its relation to the perfected eschatology of those prophets of the exile, as well as to the post-exilic literature of the Apocrypha (for example the II. Book of Maccabees) is like that "of the protevangelium to the perfected soteriology of revelation; it presents only the first lines of the picture, which is worked up in detail later on, but also an outline, sketched in such a way that all the knowledge of later times may be added to it" (Delitzsch)—as from of old the Church has been doing, and still is doing, in her epitaphs, hymns, liturgies, and musical compositions, and this too with some degree of right, although largely in violation of the law of exegetical sobriety.

[The following additional considerations, suggested by the passage, and the context, may be urged in favor of the view here advocated. (1) Job, as the context shows, is, while uttering this sublime prediction, painfully conscious of what he is suffering *in the body*. Note the whole passage, vers. 13-20, where the estrangement of his most intimate friends and kindred is associated with the loathsome condition into which his disease has brought him. Note again how in the heart of the prophecy itself (ver. 26), he is still unable to repress the utterance of this same painful consciousness of his bodily condition. If now he anticipates here a Divine Intervention which is to vindicate him, is it not natural that he should include in that vindication, albeit vaguely and remotely, some compensation for the physical wrong he was suffering? If God would appear to recompense the indignity to his good name, would He not appear at the same time to recompense the indignity from which his body had so grievously suffered? In a word, would not the same experience which here blossoms so gloriously into the prophetic assurance of a justification of his spiritual integrity, bear at least the bud of a resurrection hope for the body, although the latter would be, *ex necessitate rei*, less perfectly developed than the former? Surely the Day of Restitution, which he *knows* is to come, will bring with it some compensation for this grievous bodily ill, the dark shadow of which flits across even this bright vision of faith! This presumption is still further heightened when we note that he himself, *with his own eyes*, is to witness that restitution.

(2). The phrase עַל־עָפָר is not without significance. It certainly means something more specific than "on the earth." The Goel is to stand "on dust" (or "on the dust"—article poetically omitted), the place where lies the dust of the body gathered to the dust of the earth. This is the only exegesis of עפר that is either etymologically admissible, or suited to the context. The Vindication is thus brought into local connection with the grave. And this can mean only one thing. It shows at least that Job could not conceive of this future restitution as taking place away and apart from his dust His body, his physical self, was in some way—he has no conception how—to be interested in it.

(3). The expression מִבְּשָׂרִי is no objection to this view, even with the privative sense which our Commy. (and correctly I think) attaches to

מִן. It does not mean,—it is doubtful, as Zöckler remarks, whether for a Hebrew it *could* mean, —an abstract unqualified spirituality. At all events the connection shows that here, as often elsewhere in Job (comp. ch. vii. 15; xiv. 22; xxxiiii. 21, *etc.*), בשׂר is used specifically of the body as the seat of suffering and corruption, the *τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο* of Paul. Twice indeed in this immediate connection it is used in this sense, to wit, in ver. 19, and ver. 22 (figuratively, however). Observe particularly that in ver. 19, as in ver. 26 the "flesh" is associated with the "skin" in describing his emaciated condition. When therefore he describes his physical condition at the time of his ultimate restitution first by the clause "after my skin, which shall have been destroyed—even this!" and then by the clause, "and without my flesh," what he means evidently is, when skin and flesh are both no more, when the destruction, the decay, begun by disease, and to be continued in the grave, has finished its course; then would he behold God. —"After my skin"—and "without my flesh" are thus parallelistic equivalents, of which still another equivalent is found in "dust," the last result of bodily decay.—These elements of the passage thus fix the *place* and the *time* of the coming restitution; the place—the grave, the time—the remote future, when his body should be dust.

It seems clear therefore that the passage cannot be regarded on the one hand as a distinct formal enunciation of a literal resurrection, for the last view which he gives us of his body is as that which is no more, as dust. Just as little on the other hand is it a mere vindication of his memory, a declaration of the integrity of his cause, an abstract spiritual beholding of God, for he is conscious of physical suffering—he anticipates a complete restitution—one therefore which will bring some reparation of the wrong which he has suffered in the body, the grave where his dust lies is to be the scene of his vindication, and he, the אֲנִי now speaking, the personal *I* contrasted with "a stranger," as complete realistic a personality, therefore, as any זָר then living,—he is to be there, seeing with his own eyes, and exulting in the sight. This necessarily implies a rehabilitation of the *man*, as well as of his *cause*, a rehabilitation *after death*, as the terms and internal scope of the passage prove, as well as the external plan and scope of the book; and if not a resurrection, it at least carries us a long way forward in the direction of that truth. It is, as Delitzsch says above, an outline of that doctrine which needs but a few touches to complete the representation. Indeed it may be said that if the passage had contained one additional thought, more definitely linking the dust of Job's body with that future אני, that vaguely foreshadowed organism with the eyes of which he was to see God, the enunciation of a resurrection would be almost complete. But that thought is wanting. It is not in the Book of Job. That which is given, however, points to the resurrection; and the pæan of the Old Testament saint, this old "song of the night," breathing forth faith's yearning towards the "glorious appearing" of Him who is "The Last" as He is "The First," of which, though the singer understands it not, he is yet triumphantly assured, may be chanted by the Christian believer with no less confidence, and with a truer and more precious realization of what it means.

(4) The interpretation which refers the vindication of Job to this life is sufficiently refuted above. The argument, urged by Zöckler as by others, that such an anticipation of a vindication before death is inconsistent with Job's frequent declarations that he had no hope, and that he was near his grave, is perhaps fairly enough answered by Noyes: "As if a person, who is represented as agitated by the most violent and opposite emotions, could be expected to be consistent in his sentiments and language. What can be more natural than that Job, in a state of extreme depression, arising from the thought of his wrongs, the severity of his afflictions, and the natural tendency of his disease, should express himself in the language of despair, and yet that he should be animated soon after by conscious innocence and the thought of God's justice, goodness and power, to break forth into the language of hope and confidence?" Job's utterances are in fact marked by striking inconsistencies, as he is swayed by this feeling or by that. The following considerations are, however, decisive against this view.

a. It furnishes a far less adequate explanation of the remarkable elevation and ardor of feeling which Job here exhibits than the other view, which refers it to the hereafter.

b. However well it may harmonize with some of the expressions used, there are others with which it is altogether irreconcilable. This is especially true of עַל־עָפָר יָקוּם and the preposition in מִבְּשָׂרִי. It may also be said that אַחַר —which is best explained as a preposition before עוֹרִי—implies a state wherein the skin has ceased to be, in like manner as מִן before בְּשָׂרִי. Both these prepositions carry us forward to an indefinitely remote period after death, and are thus inconsistent with the idea of a physical restoration before death. It is especially inconceivable that the poet should have used עַל־עָפָר to describe the place where the God should appear, if the appearance was to be before death, when it is remembered how invariably elsewhere, when mentioned in connection with Job, it is associated with the grave. Comp. chap. vii. 21; viii. 19; x. 9; xvii. 16; xx. 11; xxi. 26; xxxiv. 15.*

c. It would be, as Zöckler well argues, a serious artistic fault, were Job at this point to be introduced predicting the actual historical solution of the drama in language so definite, and this while the evolution of the drama is still going on, and the logical entanglement is at its height. According to the eschatological theory, the passage before us is a momentary gleam of brightness from the Life Beyond, which lights up with preternatural beauty the lurid centre of the dark drama before us, which, however it may modify the development which fol-

* Even in chap. xli. 25 [33] it suggests, as Umbreit correctly observes, earth as a transitory state of activity for leviathan.

lows, leaves it essentially unchanged, moving on towards its historic consummation, according to the plan which our poet has so grandly conceived and so steadfastly pursued thus far. The light which here breaks through the clouds is from a source much further than the setting of Job's earthly day. It is a light even which sends forward its reflection to the final earthly consummation, and which rests on the latter as an ineffable halo, giving to the radiant eve of the patriarch's life a sacred beauty such as without this passage could not have belonged to it. If, on the other hand, it were an anticipation of Job's earthly restoration, it would be a sudden, violent, inexplicable thrusting of the solution into the heart of the conflict, leaving the conflict nevertheless to struggle on as before, and the solution itself to be swallowed up and forgotten, until it reappears at the close, having lost, however, through this premature suggestion of it, the majesty which attends its unexpected coming. It is true that the poet, with that rare irony which he knows so well how to use, introduces the friends as from time to time unconsciously prophesying Job's restoration. But those incidental and indirect anticipations have a very different signification from what this solemn, lofty, direct, and confident utterance from the hero himself would have, if it were referred to the issue of the poem.

(5) *Per contra*—the view advocated in the Commentary and in these Remarks has in its favor the following considerations:

a. It furnishes by far the most satisfactory explanation of the more difficult expressions of the text. See above.

b. It is most in harmony with the representations of the future found elsewhere in the book, especially chap. xiv. 13-15, of which this passage is at once the glorious counterpart and complement;—that being a prophetic yearning for the recovery of his departed personality from the gloom of Sheol, a recovery which is to be a change into a new life, even as this is a prophetic pæan of a Divine interposition which is not only to vindicate his cause, but also to realize his restored personality as a witness of the scene.

c. It is most in harmony with the doctrinal development of the Old Testament. It carries us beyond the abstract idea of a disembodied immortality to an intermediate realistic conception of the resuscitation of the whole personality, a conception which is an indispensable stepping-stone to the distinct recognition of the truth of the resurrection. The *development* of the doctrine would be incomplete, if not unintelligible, without the Book of Job, thus understood.—E.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

In the treatment of this chapter for practical edification, the passage in vers. 25-27 will of course be the centre and the goal of our meditations. It must not, however, be separated from its surroundings in such a way that on the one side the preparation and immediate occasion for the upsoaring of his soul in yearning and hope to God, to be found in the sorrowful plaint of vers. 6-20, and on the other side the stern and earnest warning to the friends, with which the whole discourse closes (vers. 28, 29), will fail of being set forth in the proper light and in their organic connection. It is fitting accordingly to show that it is one who feels himself to be forsaken by God and men, to be cast out by this world, and even by all that he held dearest in it, who here suddenly leaps up to that hope out of the most painful agitation and the profoundest depression of spirit, being supported in this flight by the train of thought developed in vers. 21-24:—that when his contemporaries refuse to hear his appeals for compassion, and when the acknowledgment of his innocence, which he has reason to expect from posterity, presents itself as something which he can by no possibility live to see for himself, God, the Everlasting One, who is above all time, still remains to him as his only consolation, although, indeed, a consolation all the more sure and powerful. Not less is it to be shown how Job, feeling himself to be, as it were, sanctified and lifted high above this lower earthly sphere by the thought of this God and the joy of future union with Him, which he waits for with such longing, immediately after the utterance of his hope turns all the more sharply against the friends, in order that—being filled as yet by the thought of God's agency in judicial retribution, through which he hopes one day to be justified —he may warn them still more urgently than before against becoming, through their continued harshness and injustice towards himself, the objects of God's retributive interposition, and of His eternal wrath. Essentially thus, only more briefly and comprehensively, does v. Gerlach give the course of thought in the entire discourse: "The pronounced sharpness, visible in the speeches of the friends, intensifies also in Job the strong and gloomy descriptions which he gives of his sufferings. But the wonderful notable antithesis which he presents—God Himself against God!—God in His dealings with him showing His anger, and inflicting punishment, but at the same time irresistibly revealing Himself to the inmost consciousness of faith as all-gracious, bringing deliverance and blessedness—this gives to the sufferer the clear light of a knowledge in which all his former faint yearnings shape themselves into fixed certainty. God appears to him as the holy and merciful manager of his cause, and even, after a painful end, as the Giver of a blessed eternal life. . . . To the friends, however, he declares finally with sharp words, that although their legal security and rigor has already made them sure of victory, God's interposition in judgment will so much the more completely put them to shame.

Particular Passages.

Ver. 6 seq. Brentius: When conscience confronts the judgment, when it cries out to God in trouble, and its prayer is not answered, it accuses God of injustice. . . . But the thoughts of a heart forsaken by the Lord are in this passage most beautifully described; for what else can it think, when all aid is withdrawn, than that God is unjust, if, after first taking sin away, He nevertheless pays the wages of sin, even death? and if again, after promising that He will be nigh to those who are in trouble, He seems not only not to be affected, but even to be

delighted by our calamities? When the flames of hell thus rage around us, we must look to Christ alone, who was made in all things like to His brethren, and was tempted that He might be able to succor those who are tempted.—ZEYSS: There is no trial more grievous than when in affliction and suffering it seems as though God had become our enemy, has no compassion upon us, and will neither hear nor help.—IDEM (on ver. 13 seq.): To be forsaken and despised by one's own kindred and household companions is hard. But herein the children of God must become like their Saviour, who in His suffering was forsaken by all men, even by His dearest disciples and nearest relations: thus will they learn to build on no man, but only on the living God, who is ever true—EGARD: Friends do not (usually) adhere in trial and need; with prosperity they take their departure, forgetful of their love and troth. Men are liars; they are inconstant as the wind, which passes away. But because trial and need come from God, the withdrawal of friends is ascribed to God, for had He not caused the trial to come, the friends would have remained.

Ver. 23 seq. WOHLFARTH: The wish of the pious sufferer that his history might be preserved for posterity, was fulfilled. In *hundreds* of languages the truth is now proclaimed to all the people of the earth—that even the godly man is not free from suffering, but in the consciousness of his innocence, and in faith in God, Providence and Immortality, he finds consolation which will not permit him to sink, and his patient waiting for the glorious issue of God's dark dispensations, is crowned without fail.

Ver. 25 seq. OECOLAMPADIUS: These are the words of Job's faith, nay, of that of the Church Universal, which desires that they may be transmitted to all ages: "And I know," *etc.* . . . . . We, taking faith for our teacher, and remembering what great things Job has declared beforehand he is about to set forth here, understand it of the resurrection. We believe that we shall see Christ, our Judge, in this body which we now bear about, and in no other, with these eyes, and no others. For as Christ rose again in the same body in which He suffered and was buried, so we also shall rise again in the same body in which we now carry on our warfare.—BRENTIUS: A most clear confession of faith! From this passage it may be seen what is the method of true faith, *viz.*, in death to believe in life, in hell to believe in heaven, in wrath and judgment to believe in God the Redeemer, as the Apostle, whoever he may have been, truly says in writing to the Hebrews: Faith is the substance of things hoped for, *etc.* (Heb. xi. 1). For in Job nothing is less apparent than life and the resurrection; rather is it hell that is perceived. "Nevertheless," he says, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, however He may now seem to sleep and to be angry; nevertheless I know and by faith I behold beneath this wrath great favor, beneath this condemner a redeemer. You will observe in this place how despair and hope succeed each other by turns in the godly."—STARKE (after Zeyss and Joach. Lange): As surely as that Christ, our Redeemer, is risen from death by His power, and is entered into His glory, so surely will all who believe in Him rise again to eternal life by His divine power. . . . The Messiah is in such wise the Living One, yea more, the Life itself (John xiv. 6; xi. 25), in that he proves Himself to be the Living One, by making us alive. . . . This is the best comfort in the extremity of death, that as Christ rose again from the dead, therefore we shall arise with him (Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv.).—V. GERLACH: It is remarkable in this passage that Job, after indulging in those most gloomy descriptions of the realm of the dead, which run through his discourses from ch. iii. on, should here soar up to such a joyous hope touching his destiny after death. Precisely this, however, constitutes the very kernel of the history that through his fellowship with God Job's sufferings become the means, first, of overcoming in himself that legal stand-point, with which that gloomy, cheerless outlook was most closely united, and thereby of gaining the victory over the friends with their legalistic tendencies.—Moreover, we must not be led astray by the fact that in the end Job's victory is set even for this life, and that he receives an earthly compensation for his losses. The meaning of this turn of events is *that God gives to His servant, who has shown himself to be animated by such firm confidence in Himself, more than he could ask or think.*

Ver. 28 seq. SEB. SCHMIDT: Job's friends knew that there is a judgment, and they had proceeded from this principle in their discussions thus far. Job accordingly would speak of the subject here not in the abstract, but in connection with the matter under consideration: "in order that ye may know that God will administer judgment in respect to all iniquities of the sword, which you among yourselves imagine to be of no consequence, and not to be feared, and that He will punish them most severely."—CRAMER: God indeed punishes much even in this life; but much is reserved for the last judgment. Hence he who escapes temporal punishment here, will not for that reason escape all divine punishment.

III. Zophar and Job: Ch. XX.—XXI.

A.—Zophar: For a time indeed the evil-doer can be prosperous; but so much the more terrible and irremediable will be his destruction.

CHAPTER XX.

1. **Introduction—censuring Job with violence, and Theme of the discourse: vers. 1-5**

1 Then answered Zophar the Naamathite, and said:

2 Therefore do my thoughts cause me to answer,
and for this I make haste.
3 I have heard the check of my reproach,
and the spirit of my understanding causeth me to answer.
4 Knowest thou not this of old,
since man was placed upon earth,
5 that the triumphing of the wicked is short,
and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment?

2. **Expansion of the theme, showing from experience that the prosperity and riches of the ungodly must end in the deepest misery: vers. 6–29.**

6 Though his excellency mount up to the heavens,
and his head reach unto the clouds;
7 yet he shall perish forever, like his own dung:
they which have seen him shall say, Where is he?
8 He shall fly away as a dream, and shall not be found;
yea, he shall be chased away as a vision of the night.
9 The eye also which saw him shall see him no more;
neither shall his place any more behold him.
10 His children shall seek to please the poor,
and his hands shall restore their goods.
11 His bones are full of the sin of his youth,
which shall lie down with him in the dust.

12 Though wickedness be sweet in his mouth,
though he hide it under his tongue;
13 though he spare, and forsake it not,
but keep it still within his mouth:
14 yet his meat in his bowels is turned,
it is the gall of asps within him.
15 He hath swallowed down riches, and he shall vomit them up again:
God shall cast them out of his belly.
16 He shall suck the poison of asps;
the viper's tongue shall slay him.

17 He shall not see the rivers,
the floods, the brooks of honey and butter.
18 That which he labored for shall he restore, and shall not swallow it down:
according to his substance shall the restitution be, and he shall not rejoice therein.
19 Because he hath oppressed, and hath forsaken the poor;
because he hath violently taken away a house which he builded not;
20 Surely he shall not feel quietness in his belly,
he shall not save of that which he desired.
21 There shall none of his meat be left;
therefore shall no man look for his goods.

22 In the fulness of his sufficiency he shall be in straits;
every hand of the wicked shall come upon him.

23 When he is about to fill his belly,
God shall cast the fury of His wrath upon him,
and shall rain it upon him while he is eating.
24 He shall flee from the iron weapon,
and the bow of steel shall strike him through.
25 It is drawn, and cometh out of the body;
yea, the glittering sword cometh out of his gall;
terrors are upon him!
26 All darkness shall be hid in his secret places;
a fire not blown shall consume him;
it shall go ill with him that is left in his tabernacle.
27 The heaven shall reveal his iniquity;
and the earth shall rise up against him.
28 The increase of his house shall depart,
and his goods shall flow away in the day of His wrath.
29 This is the portion of a wicked man from God,
and the heritage appointed unto him by God.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. A new variation of the favorite theme of the friends—the perishableness of the prosperity of the ungodly.—The formula by which it is this time expressed is (ver. 5): "The triumphing of the wicked is of short duration, and the joy of the ungodly only for a moment." In the further development of this thought the wicked, who encounters inevitable destruction, is described as a rich man, who avariciously seizes on the possessions of others, and whose property, unjustly acquired, becomes the prey of an exterminating fire that destroys himself, and all that belongs to him. This on the one side links itself to the former description of Eliphaz, ch. xv. 25 seq., on the other side, however, it glances aside with malicious suspicion at the former prosperity of Job, the foundation of which the speaker would indicate as presumably impure and unrighteous.—The discourse is divided into a short introduction (vers. 2-5), and a discussion extending through four strophes of six verses each (in one instance of five), together with a closing verse, which stands as an isolated epiphonema.

2. *Introduction*, together with the theme of the discourse: vers. 2-5.

Ver. 2. **Therefore do my thoughts give answer to me.**—[לָכֵן, by some rendered "still, yet," (Umbreit, Noyes, Rodwell), or "truly," (Elzas), but incorrectly]. הֵשִׁיב with Accus. of the person, as in ch. xiii. 22 [E. V., "cause me to answer," and so Fürst, and this would correspond with Zophar's eagerness to speak; but the other signification is the more common]. שְׂעִפִּים as in ch. iv. 13.—**And hence** (comes) **the storming within me.**—Lit. "my haste in me": חוּשׁ here in the sense of *perturbatio;* and בִּי in immediate connection with חוּשִׁי, and more precisely qualifying it, comp. ch. iv. 21.—Both לָכֵן in *a*, and בַּעֲבוּר in *b*, *point forward* to the statement given in ver. 3 of the cause of Job's discontent and excitement. ["*On this account* he feels called upon by his thoughts to answer, and *hence* his inward impulse leaves him no rest, *because* he hears from Job a contemptuous wounding reproof of himself." Ewald, Hahn, Wordsworth, *etc.*, point backward to the closing menace of Job's discourse (ch. xix. 29) as the cause of Zophar's feeling]. בַּעֲבוּר, which is evidently separated from חוּשִׁי by the accentuation is used as a preposition = "on account of," but without its complement. We must supply either כֵּן (from לָכֵן in *a*), or זֹאת; comp. the similar elliptical use of כְּעַל in Isa. lix. 18. To connect בַּעֲבוּר immediately with חוּשִׁי: "because of my storming (Del. "because of my feeling") [" because of my eager haste," Ges., Con., Carey, Noyes] within me," produces a less symmetrical structure for the verse, and a flatter sense.

Ver. 3. **A chiding to my shame must I hear!** Comp. Isa. liii. 5 ["chastisement of our peace," *i. e.*, which tends to our peace; so here, the chastisement or chiding which tends to my shame.—The E. V.'s rendering, "check of my reproach" is scarcely intelligible. Neither is "I have heard" sufficiently exact for the fut. אֶשְׁמַע, which means rather "I have to hear."—E.].—**Nevertheless the spirit out of my understanding gives me an answer**; *i. e.*, "out of the fulness of its perception it furnishes me with information as to what is to be thought of Job with his insulting attacks" (Delitzsch), *viz.*, that he is to be warned and punished as an ungodly man. [E. V., יַעֲנֵנִי, as Hiph. "causeth me to answer;" better as Kal "answereth," and thus equivalent to הֵשִׁיב, ver. 2. This exordium is strikingly suggestive of the prominent traits of Zophar's character; his mental discursiveness and vivacity, or perhaps volatility, indicated by שְׂעִפִּים, his thoughts shot forth in various directions; his eager impetuosity, חוּשִׁי, he could scarcely contain himself until Job had finished, and then broke out hotly; his proud sensitive egotism, especially prominent in ver. 3 *a*, "the chiding of *my* shame must *I* hear;"

his subjective self-sufficient dogmatism—"the *spirit out of my understanding* gives answer." It is questionable whether רוּחַ here is to be taken as Renan explains, of the universal (not as he terms it "impersonal") spirit (comp. ch. xxxii. 8), speaking in man. The dogmatic character of the speaker, and the prominence which he gives to his own personality, is not altogether in harmony with such a view. Moreover, Elihu is put forward by the poet as the representative of an internal revelation, even as Eliphaz represents the external. Zophar on the other hand represents the individual reason, as Bildad represents the collective traditional wisdom of the race. See Introduction.—E.].

Vers. 4, 5 present the substance of these communications of Zophar's spirit in the form of a question addressed to Job.

Ver. 5. **Knowest thou this indeed** [either "the question implying that the contrary would be inferred from Job's language" (Con.), or "sarcastically, equivalent to: thou surely knowest; or in astonishment, what! dost thou not know!" (Del.) hence it is unnecessary (with E. V., Ges., *etc.*), to supply the negative, הֲ = הֲלֹא] **from eternity** (*i. e.*, to be true, מִנִּי־עַד, as a virtual adjective, or as a virtual predicate-accusative, Ewald § 336, *b*), **since man was placed upon the earth.** שִׂים Infinit. with an indefinite subject, "since one placed" [or, since the placing of] as in ch. xiii. 9.—אָדָם, not precisely a proper name, referring to the first man, but collective or generic; comp. Deut. iv. 32.

Ver. 5. **That the triumphing of the wicked is short** (lit., from near, *i. e.*, not extending far; comp Deut. xxxii. 17; Jer. xxiii. 23), **and the joy of the ungodly only for a moment.**—עֲדֵי in עֲדֵי־רָגַע, like עַד in 2 Kings ix. 22 expresses the idea of duration, "during, for." The whole question is intended to convey doubt and wonder that Job, judging by his speeches, was entirely unacquainted with the familiar proposition touching the short duration of the triumphing of the wicked which is made the theme of what follows. [This is Zophar's short and cutting rejoinder to Job's triumphant outburst in ch. xix. 25 seq.—That jubilant exclamation was, as Zophar indirectly suggests, a רִנְנַת רָשָׁע, that exulting joy a שִׂמְחַת חָנֵף].

3. The expansion of the theme: vers. 6–29.

First Strophe: Vers. 6–11. [The wicked, however prosperous, perishes utterly, together with his family and acquisitions; he himself in the prime of life].

Ver. 6. **Though his height** (שִׂיא from נשׂא, comp. שׂוֹא Ps. lxxxix. 10) [*i. e.*, his exaltation in rank and power] **mount up to Heaven, and his head reach unto the clouds;** comp. Isa. xiv. 13 seq.; Obad. 4. [הִגִּיעַ, not causative (Del.), but parallel to עלה, as ראשׁ to שׂיא].

Ver. 7. **Like his dung he perishes forever; they who have seen him say: Where is he?**—The subj. here is the חָנֵף, ver. 5 *b*, and so continues to the end of the description. כְּגֶלְלוֹ, "like his dung," from גֵּל, *globulus stercoris*, Zeph. i. 17; Ezek. iv. 12, 15 (comp. גָּלָל, 1 Kings xiv. 10). This comparison, which beyond a doubt expresses a meaning which is unfavorable and disgraceful to the ungodly man, refers to *his own dung;* in the same way that this is at once swept away, on account of its ill odor, so is he speedily removed by the Divine judgment (comp. Ezek. l. c.). In regard to the coarse harshness of the expression, comp. below, ver. 15, as also Zophar's former discourse, ch. xi. 12. ["The word is not low, as Ezek. iv. 12; Zeph. i. 17 shows, and the figure, though revolting, is still very expressive." Delitzsch]. The following explanations involve an unsuitable softening [and weakening] of the sense. (1) The attempt of Wetzstein in Delitzsch [I. 377 seq. adopted by Del. and Merx] to identify גְּלָלִ with the cow-dung heaped up for fuel in the dwelling of the wicked. (2) The attempt of Schultens, Ewald, Hirz., Heiligst., [Con.], to read כְּגָלְלוֹ, "according to his greatness, in proportion as he was great," from גָּלָל, *magnificentia, majestas* [Good (followed by Wemyss) adopts this with the additional amendment of כ to ב, understanding the passage to teach that the wicked perishes in the midst of his greatness]. (3) The unfounded translation of the Syriac: "like the whirlwind" [regarding גלל, or גל as = גלגל, and so Fürst, who however defines it to mean "chaff." Either of these renderings, as well as Wetzstein's, makes the suffix superfluous.—E.]. (4) The equally untenable rendering of some of the Rabbis (as Gekatilia, Nachamanides): "as he turns himself," or "in turning around, as one turns the hand around."

Ver. 8. **As a dream he flies away [and is no more to be found: and he is scared away as a vision of the night].**—For the use of "dream" and "night-vision" (חִזָּיוֹן as in ch. iv. 13 ["so everywhere in the book of Job instead of חָזוֹן, from which it perhaps differs as *visum* from *visio*," Delitzsch]), as figures for that which is fleeting, quickly perishable, comp. Isa. xxix. 7; Ps. lxxiii. 20; xc. 5. יֻדַּד, Hiph.: "is scared away," to wit, by God's judicial intervention; a stronger expression than the Active יָדַד, "he flies."

Ver. 9. **An eye has looked upon him** (been sharply fixed upon him; שׁזף as in ch. xxviii. 7); **it does it not again**; comp. ch. v. 3; vii. 8; viii. 18. [The verb שָׁזַף is found in Cant. i. 6 in the sense of scorching, or making swarthy (cogn. שָׁרַף *adurere*). Hence the signification of a fixed scorching look is attached to it by Delitzsch. It may at least be said of it that it means as much as our "scan," or "gaze upon." It is suggested perhaps by the lofty position, the heaven-touching, cloud-capped attitude of the wicked in ver. 6. Such a height, which the sun would (שׁזף) look on, and cause to glow, the eye of man would (שׁזף) gaze on intently. The clause is thus equivalent to: There was a time when he was the observed of all observers, but it is so no more —E.].—**And his**

place beholds him no more.—מְקוֹמוֹ, which is doubtless the subject of *b*, is here construed as a feminine, as in Gen. xviii. 24; 2 Sam. xvii. 12.

Ver. 10. **His children must seek to please the poor.**—יְרַצּוּ, 3d plur. Piel from רצה = to propitiate, appease, synonymous with חִלָּה פְּנֵי־פ׳, an expression which is to be understood in a sense altogether general, and not specifically of asking alms [Barnes: "they would be beggars of beggars"] nor of appeasing by the use of money, although the second member approximates the latter meaning quite closely. The ancient versions read יָרֹצּוּ, or יְרַצְּצוּ (from רצץ), and thus obtained the meaning, which is far less suitable, "His sons (object) the lowly smite down." [Ewald, adopting this definition for the verb, and amending בָּנָיו to הָפְנָיו translates: "his fists smote down the weak"].—**And his hands** (must) **give back his wealth**: to wit, by the hands of his children, who will have to appease the creditors of their father. ["The suffix in ידיו might refer back, in the way of individualization, to the plural in בנים (so Noyes); but against this is the fact that also in the following verse the wicked man is the subject of the discourse." Schlott.]. The meaning would be much less simple if (with Carey, Dillmann) [Bernard, Renan, Lee], "his hands" were understood literally, and after the preceding mention of his death we were carried back here to the period of his life.

Ver. 11. **His bones were full of youthful vigor** (so correctly the LXX., Targ., Pesh.—while the Vulg., Rosenm., Vaih., *etc.*, understand it of "secret sins," and comp. Ps. xc. 8), [Jerome, however, followed, by E. V., Lee, and Barnes, combining the two ideas of *sin* and *youth*, while Renan, Good, Wemyss, Carey, render "secret sins." Our other authorities, Ew., Dillmann, Schlott., Rodwell, Words., Con., Ber., Elz., with Ges. and Fürst agree with the LXX., *etc.*].—**and it lies down with him in the dust**; or "it is laid down," *viz.*, his youthful vigor; for the use of תִּשְׁכָּב referring back to עֲלוּמָיו, comp. ch. xiv. 19; Ps. ciii. 5 *b*. For "dust," meaning the "grave," comp. ch. xix. 25; xvii. 16.

Second Strophe: Vers. 12-16. A description of the perishableness of the ungodly man's prosperity by a comparison with poison, sweet to the taste, but deadly in its results.

Vers. 12, 13 are the protasis dependent on אִם ver. 14 seq., the apodosis.—Ver. 12. **Though evil tastes sweet in his mouth** (הַמְתִּיק lit., "makes sweet," Ewald, § 122, *c* [Green, § 79, 2]); **he hides it under his tongue**, *i. e.*, he does not swallow it down, in order to enjoy the sweet taste of it so much the longer ["the evil-doer likened to an epicure," Delitzsch.—Renan: *Comme un bonbon qu' on laisse fondre dans la bouche*].

Ver. 13. **He is sparing of it** (חמל to indulge, to spare, here with עַל, the preposition commonly used with verbs of covering, protecting, guarding) **and does not let it go, and retains it in his palate.**—The tenacity with which the evil-doer persists in the lustful enjoyment of his wickedness, is set forth by five parallel and essentially synonymous expressions accumulated together.

Ver. 14. (Nevertheless) **his food is changed in his bowels**—into what is explained in the second member. **The poison of asps is within him.**—מְרוֹרָה (=מְרֵרָה, chap. xvi. 13), lit. "gall," is used here for "poison,"—because the ancients used interchangeably terms representing the bitter and the poisonous; comp. ראש=a bitter, poisonous plant and the poison of serpents, in ver. 16; Deut. xxxii. 33. The word is naturally chosen here as antithetic to המתיק, verse 12. [On פְּתָנִים see below, ver. 16.]

Ver. 15. **He hath swallowed down riches.**—חַיִל, "possessions, riches, property," without the accompanying notion of forcible acquisition which rather first makes its appearance in בָּלַע. **God will cast them forth again out of his belly**—*i. e.*, his riches, or that which he has swallowed. The greedy devourer of wealth will be made to vomit it forth, as by pains of colic. The LXX., from motives of decorum, substituted ἄγγελος here for θεός; in Zophar's mouth, however, the latter word need not surprise us.

Ver. 16 returns back to the figure of ver. 14 *b* in order to describe more minutely the effect of the poison which he had been enjoying. [**He sucked in the poison of asps**], **the tongue of adders slays him**—the tongue being regarded as the seat or container of the poison (Ps. cxl. 4 [3]), the original figure being at the same time changed, and the fatal bite taking the place of the deadly draught; comp. Prov. xxiii. 32. [פֶּתֶן, LXX. ἀσπίς; according to some, *e.g.*, KITTO, *Pictorial Bible*, the *boeten* of the Arabs, about a foot long, spotted black and white, the bite instantly fatal; according to others, the *el-Haje* of the Arabs, from three to five feet long, dark green, with oblique bands of brown, resembling the cobra di capello in its power of swelling the neck and rising on its tail in striking its prey. The אֶפְעֶה cannot be determined. See the *Dictionaries* and *Cyclopædias*, "Asp," "Viper," "Serpent," *etc.*]

Third Strophe: Vers. 17–22. [The evil doer cannot enjoy his prosperity—for he must restore his ill-gotten gains.]

Ver. 17. **He may not delight in the sight of** (ראה ב as in chap. iii. 9) **brooks streams, rivers of honey and cream.**—[The negative אַל and the apocopated יֵרֶא express the concurrence of the speaker's moral judgment and feeling with the affirmation of the fact. They are a mental Amen to the prediction.—E.] After פְּלַגּוֹת in the absol. state there follow in apposition two nouns in the construct state, נַהֲרֵי נַחֲלֵי, which form an assonance, and are co-ordinate. [Dillmann: "It is a more poetic artistic expression than the simple נהרי דבש ונהלי חמאה." Hupfeld conjectures that נהרי may be a gloss.

See Gesen. §255, 3 *a.*] "Honey and milk" (or here, by way of gradation, "cream," comp. Isa. vii. 15, 22) are a familiar figurative expression denoting luxurious prosperity, as in Ex. iii. 8, 17, and often; found also in the ancient classical poets, in their descriptions of the golden age; *e. g.*. Theocritus, *Idyll.* V. 124 seq.; Ovid, *Metam.* I. 111 seq.: *Flumina jam lactis, jam flumina nectaris ibant;* comp. *Virgil,* Ecl. IV. 30; *Horace,* Epod. 16, 47.

Ver. 18. **Giving back that which he has labored for** (יָגָע, subst. synonymous with יְגִיעַ) [the participial clause מֵשִׁיב יָגָע coming first, and assigning the reason for what follows] **he enjoys it not**—lit. he swallows it not, he will not be happy. **According to the property of his exchange** (תְּמוּרָה as in chap. xv. 31) **he rejoices not**—*i. e.*, in accordance with the fact that he employed sinful, unjust means of exchange, in order to gain temporal possessions and enjoyments, he has no pleasure in the latter, he must lack the joy which he had promised himself in them. So correctly Ewald, Delitzsch, Dillmann, *etc.;* while Hirzel and others [E. V. Lee, Bernard, Renan, Rodwell], following the Targum, translate as though instead of כְּחֵיל תְּמוּרָתוֹ, the passage read כְּחֵילוֹ תְּמ׳ ("as his possessions, so his exchange,' *i. e.*, his restitution). Gesenius, Schlottmann [Conant, Elzas] render: "as his property that is to be exchanged, *i. e.*, to be restored" (similarly Hupfeld: *sicut opes permutando comparatas*), which, however, yields a strained sense [and is also "contrary to the relative independence of the separate lines of the verse, which our poet almost always preserves, and is also opposed by the interposing of ולא יבלע." DEL. Carey explains: "to the full amount of its value," taking חיל in the sense of "power," or "fullness"—a doubtful signification when used in connection with property. To be noted is עלס in our Book for עלז or עלץ].

Ver. 19. **For he crushed, abandoned the poor**—*i. e.*, maltreated with persistent injustice the unprotected and defenceless. **He has taken houses** (lit, "a house," collective) **for his plunder, and builded them not**—*i. e.*, has not re-builded them, has not reached the point of reconstructing and fitting them up according to his own taste, because he was not allowed to retain permanent possession of them. Against the rendering of the Targ., Vulg., *etc.*, also of Hupfeld [and E. V.]: "he has plundered a house which he builded not," it may be urged that in that case it must have read וְלֹא בְנָהוּ. The causal relation in which the first member is placed to the second by Delitzsch: "*because* he cast down, let the destitute lie helpless, he shall not, in case he has seized a house, build it up" [Conant: "the houses he has plundered he shall not build up"] is indicated with too little clearness by the כִּי at the beginning of the verse, and yields a meaning entirely too artificial. [Other constructions, according to the causal rendering of כִּי, are (*a*) That of the E. V.: "Because he hath oppressed and hath forsaken the poor: *because* he hath violently taken away a house which he builded not; surely he shall not," *etc.;* which cannot be justified in rendering כִּי differently in ver. 19 and in ver. 20. (*b*) That of Noyes and Rodwell, who introduce the apodosis in 20 *b*. (*c*) That of Good, Lee, Wemyss, Carey,—which assumes the apodosis to be introduced by עַל־כֵּן in ver. 21 *b*.—E.].

Ver. 20. **For** (כִּי co-ordinate to that at the beginning of the preceding verse) **he knew no rest in his belly**: the seat of his gluttony or avarice. שָׁלֵו here a substantive (differently from chap. xvi. 12, where it is an adjective), synonymous with שַׁלְוָה, Prov. xvii. 1. For the sentiment comp. Isa. lix. 8. [E. V.: "he shall not feel quietness," *etc.*, overlooks the distinction of tenses in the verse: יָדַע Perfect, יְמַלֵּט Imperf. Whether we translate כִּי "for" or "because," there is a relation of antecedent and consequent between *a* and *b*. This has been the evil-doer's character—insatiable voracity; this shall be his doom—to be stripped of every thing. —E.] (Therefore) **he shall not escape with his dearest treasure.**—מִלֵּט without an object=to escape, like פִּלֵּט, chap. xxiii. 7; or also=מִלֵּט נַפְשׁוֹ, comp. Amos ii. 15. The ב in בַּחֲמוּדוֹ is the ב of accompaniment or of possession, as in chap. xix. 20. [Not, therefore, instrumental (Schlottmann—the object conceived of as the instrument), nor partitive: "of all his delights he shall save nothing" (Conant). The rendering of Carey, Elzas, *etc.:* "in his appetite he let (or lets) nothing escape," is inadmissible on account of the passive form of חמוד, which signifies not the act, but the object, of desire. —E.]

Ver. 21. **Nothing escaped his greediness [or gluttony]**: lit. "there is nought of a remainder [or of that which has escaped] to his food—comp. ch. xviii. 19. [אָכְלוֹ from אֹכֶל, not אֹכֶל (E. V. "meat"); hence, more literally still than above: "there is nothing that has escaped his eating"]. **Therefore his wealth shall not endure.**—יחיל, as in Ps. x. 5. means "to be solid, powerful, enduring." טוּב, "wealth," or also "prosperity," as in ch. xxi. 16. [E. V.: "no man shall look for his goods," which can only mean (with יחיל), no one shall wait for his property as his heir,—a meaning both less simple and less suitable than the above.]

Ver. 22. **In the fullness of his superfluity it is strait with him**—*i. e.*, distress overtakes him, meaning external poverty (not internal anguish, *etc.*), as *b* shows. The Inf. constr. מְלֹאות (written like קְרֹאות, Judg. viii. 1), from מלא, after the analogy of לה׳ verbs; comp. Gesen. §75 [§74], Rems. 20 and 21 [Green, §166, 2]. יֵצֶר with retracted tone for יֵצַר ["on

account of the following monosyllable." Del.]; comp. Gen. xxxii. 8; Ewald, § 232 *b*.—**Every hand of a wretched one** (comp. chap. iii. 20) **comes upon him** (comp. chap. xv. 21)—*viz.:* to inflict retribution on him for the violence suffered at his hands, or in order to demand of him plundered property. [The primary reference is doubtless to the victims of his own rapacity, although we may give it, with Delitzsch, a more general application: "the rich uncompassionate man becomes a defenceless prey of the proletaries."] So according to the reading עָמֵל, comp. chap. iii. 20. If, following the LXX. and the Vulg. (with Eichhorn, De Wette, *etc.*), we read עָמָל, we obtain the meaning—in itself indeed admissible, but less in harmony with vers. 19–21: "the whole power of misery comes upon him." [So Rodwell. Bernard, Noyes and Renan take יד as in chap. xxxiii. 2, for "wound" or "blow;' and translate: "every blow of misfortune" (Ren.), or "every blow of the wretched," *i. e.*, every blow which cometh upon the wretched (Noyes), or every blow, every plague that can render a man miserable (Bernard).]

Fourth Strophe: vers. 23–28. The end of the wicked according to the divine judgment.

Ver. 23. **That it may serve to the filling of his belly, He casts the glow of His wrath upon him.** — The subject is God, although He is not expressly named; as in ch. xvi. 7. The Jussive יְהִי, at the head of the verse, is rendered by most as a simple future: "it shall come to pass," *viz.* that which follows. But to express this we should rather expect וְהָיָה (as frequently with the prophets), or וַיְהִי (as frequently in prose). For this reason the construction of the Jussive as dependent on יְשַׁלַּח is to be preferred to any other (so Stickel, Hahn [Ewald], Dillmann, *etc.*). [It is certainly simpler, and in the spirit and style of Zophar in this discourse to take יְהִי as an independent verb, forming the first of the series of jussives in this verse, each of which expresses the strong sympathy of his feelings with the result which he predicts. See above on אַל־יֵרָא, ver. 17; and Dillmann's remark below.—E.]—The Jussives יְשַׁלַּח and וְיַמְטֵר, however, are to be explained on the ground that the passage is intended to set forth the necessity for God's punitive agency as established in the divine order of the world ["and at the same time to indicate his own agreement therewith." Dillm.]. In regard to the descent of the divine wrath in the form of a rain of fire, comp. above on ch. xviii. 15.—As to the phrase: "to fill the belly of any one," comp. above ver. 20; Luke xv. 16. —**And causes to rain upon him with his food.**—(בְּ serving to introduce the object; comp. ch. xvi. 4, 10). The subject here again is God. The food which He causes to rain upon the wicked, to wit, his just *punishment* (comp. ch. ix. 18; Jer. ix. 14 [15]) is called "*his* food" (לַחְמוֹ), *viz.* that of the wicked, that which he is appointed to feed upon. [Ewald: "rain upon him what can satisfy him."—Schlottm.: "Such a rain of fire, figuratively speaking, is to be the food of the ungodly, instead of the former dainty morsel of wickedness (comp. vers. 12, 13)."—Wordsworth: "He surfeited himself with rapine, and God will make him surfeit with His revenge." —Carey: "Just as in Ps. xi. 6, the wicked are said to drink snares, fire and brimstone, so here the glutton shall have them for food."] It is possible also to refer the suffix to God. Much too artificial is the rendering of the Targ., Aben-Ezra, Gerson, Delitzsch: "He causeth it to rain upon him into his flesh,"—although to be sure לחם might in accordance with Zeph. i. 17 mean "flesh." [In Zeph., however, the parallelism: "and their blood is poured forth as dust, and their flesh (לְחֻמָם) as dung," makes the application clear; whereas here the whole context points to the usual literal application.—E.]—עָלֵימוֹ, poetic, full-toned form for עָלָיו as in ch. xxii. 2; xxvii. 23. ["The morally indignant speech which threatens punishment, intentionally seeks after rare solemn words, and darksome tones." Delitzsch. The partial assonance of עלימו בלחומו may also have had some influence in determining this form, which in this instance at least can scarcely be regarded as plur., on account of the pointed individual application to Job. The rendering of E. V., Good, Lee, Wem., Rod., Elz.: "and shall rain it upon him while he is eating," is at variance with the form, and misses the striking force of the figure as given above.—E.]

Vers. 24 seq. describe how the divine decree of wrath is historically realized by the introduction of several illustrations. the first being that of a warlike pursuit and wounding ["a highly picturesque description." Ewald].—**If he flee from the iron armor** (comp. ch. xxxix. 21), **a bow of brass** (Ps. xviii. 35) **pierces him through** (comp. Judg. v. 26). [If he escapes one danger, it is only to fall into another, and from the same source]. The two members of the verse, which are put together asyndetically, are related to each other as antecedent and consequent, as in ch. xix. 4.

Ver. 25. **He draws it out** (*viz.* the arrow, in order to save his life, comp. Judg. iii. 22). [The Targ. reads מִגֵּוָה: he (the enemy, or God) draws, and it (the sword) comes out of its sheath; against which Delitzsch objects that גֵּו cannot signify *vagina*. Carey also translates שָׁלַף, "it is drawn," *i. e.* the sword of the pursuing enemy, who plunges it into him, and then draws it out again; but this is much less natural, and mars the terrible vividness of the description given of his unavailing struggle with his doom.—E.]—**Then it comes forth out of the body**; or also "out of the *back*," in case גֵּוָה, after the analogy of נהרה, ch. iii. 4, should be identified with גֵּו. But the difficulty of accomplishing such a manipulation of the weapon scarcely permits this assumption (adopted among the moderns by Dillmann), ["The evildoer is imagined as hit in the back, the arrow

consequently as passing out at the front." Del.], which, moreover, has against it the following member: **and the gleaming steel** (comes) **out of his gall** (comp. ch. xvi. 13; and above on ver. 14 of this ch.). In regard to בָּרָק, lit. "lightning," here "gleaming steel, metal head" (not a "stream of blood," as Hahn explains it), comp. Deut. xxxii. 41; Nah. iii. 3; Hab. iii. 11. —**Upon him** (come) **the terrors of death.**—The plur. אֵמִים (from אֵימָה, ch. ix. 34; xiii. 21) could indeed be connected as subject with יַהֲלֹךְ construed *ad sensum* (Hahn, Delitzsch), [Conant]; but the accents connect יַהֲלֹךְ rather with the second member of the verse, so that some such verb as "come, break upon," must be supplied with עָלָיו אֵמִים. Equally opposed to the accents, and altogether too difficult is the rendering of Rosenmüller and Hirzel [Schultens, Carey]: "he goes [departs, "he is going!" Carey] terrors upon him," *i. e.*, while terrors are upon him.

Ver. 26. Further description of the divine decree of punishment, with special reference to the wicked man's possessions.—**All darkness is hoarded up for his treasures**, *i. e.*, every kind of calamity, by divine appointment, awaits the treasures which he has gathered and laid up (צְפוּנִים as in Ps. xvii. 14; comp. Deut. xxxiii. 19). To the agency of the earthly-minded evil-doer storing up treasures for himself corresponds the agency of God in opposition storing up the destruction which is destined to overtake them. Comp. θησαυρίζειν ἑαυτῳ ὀργήν, Rom. ii. 5. [As Delitzsch suggests, there is somewhat of a play upon words in טָמוּן לִצְפוּנָיו].—**A fire which is not blown consumes him**, lit. "which was not blown" (לֹא־נֻפָּח, a relative clause, Gesenius, § 143, 1 [§ 121, 3], hence a "fire of God" burning down from heaven (comp. ch. i. 16; xviii. 15; Is. xxxiii. 11 seq.). תְּאָכְלֵהוּ is most simply explained (with Ewald, Hupfeld, Dillmann) [Fürst, Conant], as an alternate form of the Jussive Kal, instead of the more common תֹּאכְלֵהוּ, comp. Ewald, § 253, *a*. [Gesenius takes it as Piel for תְּאַכְּלֵהוּ, with lengthened vowel in place of *Daghesh-forte;* Delitzsch as Poel with Hholem shortened to Kamets-Khatuph; Hirzel, Olsh., Green (§ 93, *a;* § 111, 2, *e*) as Pual for תְּאֻכְּלֵהוּ, with the rendering: "a fire not blown shall be made to consume them." In נֻפָּח the gender of אֵשׁ is disregarded. the adoption of the masc. in both the verbs נפח and ירע making the personification of the supernatural fire more vivid. See on רוח ch. i. 19.—E.]—**It must devour that which survives** (that which has escaped former judgments; שָׂרִיד as in ver. 21) **in his tent.**—יֵרַע is Jussive Kal [to be explained like the preceding Jussives, vers. 17, 23] from רעה, "to graze, to feed upon," the subject here being אֵשׁ used in the masc.; comp. for this rare masc. usage of אֵשׁ Ps. civ. 4; Jerem. xlviii. 45. Olshausen's emendation to יֵרָע (Jussive Niph.= "it shall be devoured") is unnecessary. [E. V., Bernard, Barnes, Carey, *etc.*, render: "It shall fare ill with him that is left," *etc.*, or "That which is left, *etc.*, shall perish, or be destroyed" (Lee, Wemyss, Elzas, *etc.*), some deriving the form from רוע, "to fare ill," others from ירע in the same sense (Mercier, Carey), others from רעע, either Kal (Fürst) or Niph. (Dathe, Lee). The context favors the root רעה.—E.]

Ver. 27. **The heavens reveal his iniquity** (יְגַלּוּ also properly Jussive like the verbs in vers. 26, 28), **and the earth riseth up against him** (מִתְקוֹמָמָה pausal form for מִתְקוֹמְמָה). Thus the two chief divisions of the creation, which Job had previously (ch. xvi. 18 seq.) summoned as witnesses in behalf of his innocence, must rather testify the opposite, must thrust him out from themselves as one condemned by God, so that there remains for him as his abode only the gloomy Sheol, the third division of the creation besides heaven and earth; comp. ch. xi. 8, 9; Ps. cxxxv. 6; Sir. xxiv. 7-9.

Ver. 28. **The increase of his house must depart, flowing forth** (lit. "things that flow, or run away," *diffluentia*, in apposition to יְבוּל) **in the day of His wrath**, *viz.* the divine wrath. Ges., Olsh. [Gr., § 140, 2], *etc.*, explain נִגָּרוֹת as Part. Niph. from גרר with an Aram. formation, defining it to mean *opes corrasæ*, things which have been scraped or gathered together; but less satisfactorily, for the clause בְּיוֹם אַפּוֹ, at the end of this member of the verse, hardly permits us to look for a second subject, synonymous with יְבוּל. Moreover we must have found that thought expressed rather by נגרותיו=*opes ab eo corrasae.* As it would seem that after ver. 27 a return to the wicked man's possessions and treasures could not properly be looked for, some commentators have indulged in attempted emendations of the passage, all of which touch upon יגל in the first member (Jussive Kal from גלה, "to depart, to wander forth, comp. Prov. xxvii. 25). Thus Dathe, Stickel, *etc.*, read יָגֹל—"the flood rolls away his house, *etc.*:" Ewald, יָגֵל—"the revenue of his house must roll itself away (like a torrent;" comp. Amos v. 27): Dillmann finally יִגָּל, Jussive Niphal of גלה—"the produce of his house must become apparent as that which flows away in the day of His wrath."

Ver. 29. Closing verse, lying outside of the strophic arrangement, like ch. v. 27, *etc.*—**This is the portion of the wicked man from Elohim**; the lot or "portion" (חֵלֶק, comp. ch. xxvii. 13; xxxi. 2) assigned to him by Elohim, [אָדָם רָשָׁע, "a rare application of אָדָם, comp. Prov. vi. 12 instead of which אִישׁ is more usual," Del.].—**And the heritage appointed to him by God.**—נַחֲלַת אִמְרוֹ, lit. "his heri-

tage of the word," *i. e.*, his heritage as appointed to him by a word, by a command, a judicial sentence (אֹמֶר in this sense only here; but used similarly nevertheless in Ps. lxxvii. 9; Heb. iii. 9. It is possible moreover to take the suffix in אִמְרוֹ as genitive of the object to אֹמֶר [or אֵמֶר], in which case the sense would be: "the heritage of the command concerning him." In this case however the construction would be a much harsher one. ["חלק and נחלת taken in connection with the יבול of the preceding verse form a striking oxymoron: that his heritage be taken away from him, that is the heritage adjudged to him by God." Schlottmann].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

This second discourse of Zophar's, which is at the same time the last of the utterances directed by him against Job—for in the third act of the colloquy he does not speak—as respects the passionate obstinacy with which it urges the *one* ever repeated dogma and fundamental axiom of the friends is related to the second discourse of Eliphaz in chapter xv., as superlative to positive, and to the second discourse of Bildad, as superlative to comparative. In it the narrow-minded, legal, as well as unfriendly and unjust opposition of the friends to the misunderstood sufferer appears at its height, as was the case with the former discourse of Zophar in its relation to its two predecessors.—Neither does it present any new thoughts in opposition to Job, any more than the immediately preceding discourses of Eliphaz and Bildad. The terrible picture of the judgment of wrath upon the sinner, with the delineation of which, true to the pattern presented by those two discourses, it is principally, and indeed almost exclusively occupied, exhibits scarcely anything that is materially new or original. Only as regards its formal execution does this picture of horror surpass its two predecessors. It excels in its adroit presentation, and in its skilful, and to some extent original treatment of the familiar figures and phraseology of the Chokmah. This descriptive power, which in the effects produced by it proves itself to be not inconsiderable, seems indeed to be wholly subservient to the speaker's spirit and purpose, which are characterized by hateful suspicion and vehement accusation. This materially weakens the impression which it is calculated to produce. "It is not possible to illustrate the principle that the covetous, unmerciful rich man is torn away from his prosperity by the punishment God decrees for him, more fearfully and more graphically than Zophar does it; and this terrible description is not overdrawn, but true and appropriate—but in opposition to Job it is the extreme of uncharitableness which outdoes itself: applied to him the fearful truth becomes a fearful lie. For in Zophar's mind Job is the godless man, whose rejoicing does not last long, who indeed raises himself towards heaven, but as his own dung, (comp. on ver. 7) must he perish, and to whom the sin of his unjust gain is become as the poison of the viper in his belly. The arrow of God's wrath sticks fast in him; and though he draw it out, it has already inflicted on him a deservedly mortal wound! The fire of God which has already begun to consume his possessions, does not rest until even the last remnant in his tent is consumed. The heavens, when in his self-delusion he seeks the defender of his innocence, reveal his guilt, and the earth which he hopes to have as a witness in his favor, rises up as his accuser. Thus mercilessly does Zophar seek to stifle the new trust which Job conceives towards God, and to extinguish the faith which bursts upward from beneath the ashes of the conflict. His method is soul-destroying; he seeks to slay the life which germinates from the feeling of death, instead of strengthening it." (Delitzsch). Comp. what Brentius says in his straightforward striking way: "Zophar to the end of the chapter puts forth the most correct opinions; but he is at fault in that he falsely distorts them against Job, just as though Job were afflicted for impiety, and asserted his innocence out of hypocrisy, and not out of the faith of the Gospel."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

As regards the homiletic treatment of this discourse, the same may be said in general as of the discourses, related as to their contents, in chapters 15 and 18. The description given of the perishableness of the prosperity of the ungodly, and of their just punishment at the last through the judgment of God, has its objective truth and value for the practical life; but the vehement tone of the representation, and the many unmistakable allusions to Job as the object of the speaker's unfriendly suspicion, destroy the pure enjoyment of the discourse, and compel us to regard the picture, skilful as it is in itself, with critical caution.

Particular Passages.

Ver. 8. BRENTIUS: The state of the ungodly is compared to the most unsubstantial things, to wit, to a dream, and to visions of the night, which, while they are seen, seem to be something, but when the dreamer awakens, there is nothing remaining, as is set forth in Is. xxix.

Ver. 10. IDEM: From this verse we learn whence the poverty, and whence the wealth of children proceeds, *viz.*, from the piety of parents (Ps. xxxvii. 25).—WEIMAR BIBLE: The reason why many children suffer great misfortune, and especially poverty, lies often in their own sin, but it also proceeds oftentimes from the wickedness of their parents (Ex. xx. 5). He therefore who would see his children prosperous, let him beware of sin.

Ver. 12 seq STARKE: Sinful pleasure is commonly transformed into pain. When sin is first tasted it is sweet like sugar, but afterwards it bites like an adder (Prov. xx. 17; xxiii. 32; Sir. xxi. 2 seq.).

Ver. 20 seq. BRENTIUS: As water can never satisfy the dropsical, but the more it is drank, the more it is thirsted for; so riches never satisfy the mind's lust, for the human mind can be satisfied with no good, save God (Eccl. i. 8). Hence it comes to pass by God's righteous decree, that as the avaricious man is discontented with what he has, as well as what he has not, so the ungodly man never has enough, however

much property he may possess, because he is without God, in whom all good things are stored. You have an example of this in Alexander the Great, who, not content with the sovereignty of one world, groaned on learning that there were more worlds.

Ver. 27. IDEM: Creatures, when they see the impieties and crimes of the ungodly, are silent until God pronounces judgment; but when His judgment is revealed, then all creatures betray the crimes which the ungodly have committed in their presence. In Christ however the sins of all the godly are covered, nay, are absorbed.—WOHLFARTH: Nature is leagued against sin! It is an incontrovertible truth which we find here, written thousands of years ago—he who departs from God's ways contends against heaven and earth, which from the beginning of the ages have been arrayed against sin, as a revolt against God's sacred ordinances.

B.—JOB: That which experience teaches concerning the prosperity of the ungodly during their life on earth argues not *against* but *for* his innocence:

CHAPTER XXI.

1. Introductory appeal to the friends:

VERSES 1–6.

1 But Job answered and said:

2 Hear diligently my speech,
and let this be your consolations.
3 Suffer me that I may speak;
and after that I have spoken, mock on.
4 As for me, is my complaint to man?
and if it were so, why should not my spirit be troubled?
5 Mark me, and be astonished,
and lay your hand upon your mouth.
6 Even when I remember I am afraid,
and trembling taketh hold on my flesh.

2. Along with the fact of the prosperity of the wicked, taught by experience (vers. 7-16), stands the other fact of earthly calamity befalling the pious and the righteous:

VERSES 7–26.

7 Wherefore do the wicked live,
become old, yea, are mighty in power?
8 Their seed is established in their sight with them,
and their offspring before their eyes.
9 Their houses are safe from fear,
neither is the rod of God upon them.
10 Their bull gendereth and faileth not;
their cow calveth, and casteth not her calf.

11 They send forth their little ones like a flock,
and their children dance.
12 They take the timbrel and harp,
and rejoice at the sound of the organ.
13 They spend their days in wealth,
and in a moment go down to the grave.
14 Therefore they say unto God, Depart from us,
for we desire not the knowledge of Thy ways.
15 What is the Almighty that we should serve Him?
and what profit should we have, if we pray unto Him?
16 Lo, their good is not in their hand!
the counsel of the wicked is far from me.

17 How oft is the candle of the wicked put out?

and how oft cometh their destruction upon them?
God distributeth sorrows in His anger.
18 They are as stubble before the wind,
and as chaff that the storm carrieth away.
19 God layeth up His iniquity for His children:
He rewardeth him, and he shall know it.
20 His eyes shall see his destruction,
and he shall drink of the wrath of the Almighty.
21 For what pleasure hath he in his house after him,
when the number of his months is cut off in the midst?

22 Shall any teach God knowledge?
seeing He judgeth those that are high.
23 One dieth in his full strength,
being wholly at ease, and quiet.
24 His breasts are full of milk,
and his bones are moistened with marrow.
25 And another dieth in the bitterness of his soul,
and never eateth with pleasure.
26 They shall lie down alike in the dust.
and the worms shall cover them.

3. Rebuke of the friends because they set forth only one side of that experience, and use it to his prejudice.

VERSES 27–34.

27 Behold, I know your thoughts,
and the devices which ye wrongfully imagine against me.
28 For ye say, Where is the house of the prince?
and where are the dwelling-places of the wicked?
29 Have ye not asked them that go by the way?
and do ye not know their tokens?—
30 that the wicked is reserved to the day of destruction?
they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath.

31 Who shall declare his way to his face?
and who shall repay him what he hath done?
32 Yet shall he be brought to the grave,
and shall remain in the tomb.
33 The clods of the valley shall be sweet unto him,
and every man shall draw after him,
as there are innumerable before him.
34 How then comfort ye me in vain,
seeing in your answers there remaineth falsehood?

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. The obstinacy of the friends, who show neither the desire nor the inclination to solve the mystery of Job's sufferings in a friendly spirit, and in such a way as would not wound his feelings, drives Job to come out in theoretic opposition to the narrow and external interpretation of the doctrine of retribution advocated by them, and to change his reply from the essentially personal character which it had previously borne into a strict criticism of their doctrine. Having first calmly but bitterly challenged their attention to that which he had to communicate to them (vers. 2-6), he urges against them the mysterious fact that often the ungodly revel in superfluity of prosperity to the end of their life, while on the contrary the pious are often throughout their earthly life pursued by misfortune (vers. 7-26). In view of a distribution of prosperity and adversity so unequal, and so much at variance with the moral desert of men, it was decidedly unjust, nay malicious and false on the part of the friends to undertake to brand him as a wicked man on account of his misfortune (vers. 27-34). The whole discussion which brilliantly demonstrates Job's superiority over the friends in respect to the stand-point of ethical perception and experience, and which serves to introduce the last turn which the colloquy takes, and which is decisive of his complete victory, is divided into five strophes, of five verses each, the first strophe covering the exordium (vers. 2-6), the remaining four constituting the Second Division [the former two of these strophes again being occupied with the fact, the latter two with the argument showing the fact to

be irreconcilable with their theory of retribution; Dillm.]; followed by two strophes of four verses each [rebuking the one-sidedness of the friends] constituting the Third Division (vers. 27-34.)

2. *First Division* (and strophe): *Exordium:* vers. 2-6. Job announces that he is about to speak of a mysterious and indeed an astounding phenomenon, which demands the entire attention of the friends.

Ver. 2. **Hear, I pray, hear my speech! and let this be instead of your consolations**—or: "in order that this may supply the place of your consolations, may prove to me a comfort instead of them, seeing that they so poorly accomplish their purpose" (comp. ch. xv. 11; xvi. 2). [A fine touch of irony: attentive silence would be a much more real comfort than all their ineffectual talk!]

Ver. 3. **Suffer me** (שָׂאוּנִי, with Kamets before the tone, comp. Jon. i. 12; 1 Kings xx. 33; Gesenius § 60 [§ 59] Rem. 1)—**and then will I speak** (*I*, אָנֹכִי, in contrast with the "you" of the Imper., although without a particularly strong accent); **and after that I have spoken, thou mayest mock** (תַלְעִיג, concessive, Ewald § 136, *e*). The demand for a patient hearing of his rebuke, which reminds us somewhat of the saying of Themistocles—"Strike, but hear me!" (Plutarch, Themist. c. 11), is specifically addressed in the second half to Zophar, whose last discourse must have grieved him particularly, and who in fact after the rejoinder which Job now makes had nothing more to say, and could only leave the mocking assaults on Job to be resumed by his older companions. [So in xvi. 3 Job had singled out Eliphaz in his reply, and again in ch. xxvi. 2-4, he singles out Bildad].

Ver. 4. **Does my complaint go forth from me in regard to man?** *i. e.* as for me (אָנֹכִי emphatically prefixed, and then resumed again in שִׂיחִי, Gesen. § 145 [§ 142], 2), is my complaint directed *against men?* is my complaint (שִׂיחַ as in ch. vii. 13; ix. 27; x. 1), concerning men, or is it not rather concerning something that has a *superhuman* cause, something that is decreed *by God?* That in this last thought lies the tacit antithesis to לְאָדָם is evident from the second member: **or why should I not be impatient?** lit. "why should my spirit not become short," comp. ch. vi. 11; Mic. ii. 7; Zech. xi. 8; Prov. xiv. 29. That which follows gives us to understand more distinctly that it was something quite extraordinary, superhuman, under the burden of which Job groans, and concerning which he has to complain. [The rendering of the last clause found in E. V. Lee, Wemyss, *etc.:* "And if it were so, why should not my spirit be troubled?" is both less natural, in view of the antecedent probability that וְאִם is cor-related to the ה interrogative, less simple, and less satisfactory in the meaning which it yields. E.].

Ver. 5. **Turn ye to me and be astonished, and lay the hand on the mouth,** *viz.:* as being dumb with astonishment, comp. ch. xxix. 9; xl. 4—וְהַשַּׁמּוּ Imper. cons. Hiph. from שָׁמֵם (comp. ch. xvii. 8; xviii. 20) [with Pattach for Tsere in pause], *obstupescite.* According to the reading הֻשַּׁמּוּ (Imper. Hoph. of the same verb) [as some regard it even with the punctuation הָשַׁמּוּ=hoshammu] the meaning is not essentially different.

Ver. 6. **Verily if I think on it I am confounded** (וְנִבְהָלְתִּי apodosis; comp. ch. vii. 14) **and my flesh seizes on horror.** In Heb. בְּשָׂרִי is subject; comp. the similar phraseology in ch. xviii. 20. פַּלָּצוּת, from פָּלַץ chap. ix. 6, means convulsive quaking, terror, as in the New Testament ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν (Mark xiv. 33). It is to be noted how by these strong expressions the friends are prepared to hear something grave, fearful, astounding, to wit a proposition, founded on experience, which seems to call in question the divine justice, and to the affirmation of which Job accordingly proceeds hesitatingly, and with visible reluctance.

3. *Second Division:* First Half: The testimony of experience to the fact that the wicked are often, and indeed ordinarily prosperous: vers. 7-16.

Second Strophe: vers. 7-11. **Why do the wicked live on**—instead of dying early, as Zophar had maintained, chap. xx. 5. The same question is propounded by Jeremiah, ch. xii. 1 seq.; comp. Ps. lxxiii. Mal. iii. 13 seq. **Become old, yea, strong in power,** or: "are become old (lit. advanced in years, comp. עָתִיק) and mighty in possessions." In regard to גָּבַר חַיִל (with accus. of specification) comp. the equivalent phrase הִשְׂגּוּ חַיִל, Ps. lxxiii. 12; and in regard to חַיִל see above ch. xv. 29; xx. 15, 18.

Ver. 8. **Their posterity is established** נָכוֹן here not—"standing in readiness," as in ch. xii. 5; xv. 23, but "enduring, firmly established, as in (Ps. xciii. 2) **before them round about them,** surrounding them in the closest proximity; this is the meaning of עִמָּם, not: "like themselves" (Rosenm., Umbreit, Schlottm., Vaih., [Fürst, Noyes] *etc.*), in behalf of which latter signification to be sure ch. ix. 26 might be cited; but the parallel expression —"before their eyes"—in the second member, favors rather the former sense. [**And their offspring before their eyes.** צֶאֱצָאִים, as in ch. v. 25—"is exactly expressed by our *issue,* though perhaps the reduplication rather implies *issue's issue.*" Carey]. Job, having been himself so ruthlessly stripped of his children, makes prominent above all else *this* aspect of the external prosperity of the wicked, that namely which is exhibited in a flourishing posterity, a fine trait of profound psychological truth! [To be noted moreover is the pathetic repetition of the thought in both members of the verse, and its no less pathetic resumption in ver. 11. This picture of a complete and peaceful household, with its circle of joyous youth fascinates the be-

reaved father's heart exceedingly, and he dwells on it with yearning fondness!]

Ver. 9. **Their houses** [are] **peace** (שָׁלוֹם, the same as בְּשָׁלוֹם; comp. ch. v. 24 [where see rem. in favor of the more literal and forcible rendering obtained by not assuming the preposition at all; E.] Isaiah xli. 3) **without fear.** מִפַּחַד, like מִבְּשָׂרִי ch. xix. 26; (comp. ch. xi. 15; Is. xxii. 3) **and the rod of Eloah cometh not upon them,** *i. e.* to punish them; comp. שֵׁבֶט in ch. ix. 34; xxxvii. 13 [How different from the fate of his own "house!" No such "Terror," no such "Scourge" as that which had made his a ruin!—E.].

Ver. 10. From the state of the household the description turns to that of the cattle, with the peculiarity that here exceptionally the sing. takes the place of the plur., which is used almost throughout to designate the wicked (so again below ver. 19, and in like manner ch. xxiv. 5, 16 seq.). **His bull gendereth and faileth not** (Zöckler lit.—"his bull covereth and impregnates"]. שׁוֹר, in itself of common gender, is here indicated as a masc. both by the contrast with פָּרָה in *b*, and by its predic. עִבַּר, "to cover, to gender" (comp. עָבוּר "produce fruit," Josh. v. 11, 12). The additional strengthening clause וְלֹא יַגְעִל, *neque efficit ut ejiciat* (*semen*) indicates that the impregnation is successful. The second member is entirely parallel.—**His cow calveth easily** (פִּלֵּט, synon. with הִמְלִיט, מִלֵּט, Is. xxxiv. 15; lxvi. 7) **and miscarries not,** *neque abortum patitur*, comp. Gen. xxxi. 38; Ex. xxiii. 26.

Ver. 11. Once more Job recurs to the fairest instance of earthly prosperity, the possession of a flourishing troop of children. On עֲוִילִים comp. above on ch. xix. 18 [where however the word suggests, as it does not necessarily here, a bad quality in the children themselves; Bernard's rendering "they send forth their wicked little children," introduces an incongruous element into the picture, which Job contemplates here as a pleasing and attractive one.—E.] As to שִׁלַּח, "to send forth, to let loose," see Isa. xxxii. 20.

Third Strophe: Vers. 12–16. **They** (the wicked) **sing loud with the playing of timbrel and harp;** hence with joyous festivity, as in Isa. v. 12.—יִשְׂאוּ (scil. קוֹל) lit. "they raise their voice," *i. e.*, in loud jubilations or songs of joy; comp. Is. xlii. 11.—בְּתֹף וְכִנּוֹר, used as in Ps. xlix. 5 [4] of the musical accompaniment; hence, "*with, to* the timbrel and harp." On the contrary the reading preferred by the Masora and several Rabbis, כְּתֹף ו׳ would signify "*at, during* the playing of the timbrel, *etc.*" (כְּ of the proximate specification of time, as in כָּעֵת ["*about* the time"], כִּמְעַט, *etc.*). Concerning עוּגָב, instead of which several MSS. and Ed's. have in ch. xxx. 31 עֻגָב, and in Ps. cl. 4 עֻגָב, comp. Delitzsch on Gen. iv. 21; Winer, Realwörterb. II., 123 seq. ["The three musical instruments here mentioned are certainly the most ancient, and are naturally the most simple, and indeed may be regarded as the originals of every species of musical instrument that has since been invented, all which may be reduced to three kinds—string instruments, wind instruments, and instruments of percussion; and the כִּנּוֹר *harp*, the עוּגָב, *pipe*, and the תֹּף, *tabor*, may be considered as the first representatives of each of these species respectively." Carey, see illustrations in Carey, p. 453 seq., and Smith *Bib. Dict.* under "Harp, Timbrel, and Organ"].

Ver. 13. **They spend in prosperity their days.**—So according to the K'ri יְכַלּוּ (lit. "they complete, finish," comp. ch. xxxvi. 11; Ps. xc. 9), while the K'thibh יְבַלּוּ would be, according to Isa. lxv. 22 = "they use up, wear out" (*usu conterunt*) [which is more expressive than the K'ri, signifying not only that they bring their life to an end, but that they use it up, get out of it all the enjoyment that is in it.—E.]. In either case the affirmation is made in direct contradiction to the opposite descriptions of Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar, as *e. g.*, ch. xv. 32; xviii. 14; xx. 11.—**And in a moment** (בְּרֶגַע like our "in a trice" [Germ.: "*im Nu*"], hence quickly, easily, without a struggle) **they sink down to Sheol,**—they thus enjoy a quick death, free from suffering, having fully enjoyed their life even to the end. The connection does not allow us to understand it of an "*evil* sudden death," but rather requires the idea of a euthanasy.—יֵחַתּוּ might in itself be the Imperf. Niph. of חתת: "they are frightened down" [others, *e. g.*, Bernard; "they are crushed, or hurled down"], to which however the *Accus. loci* שְׁאוֹל is ill suited. More correctly the form is derived from נחת, the Imperf. of which is written either יִנְחַת, or יֵחַת. It may be read here either יֵחָתוּ (for יֵחֲתוּ—so Ewald, Hirzel), or with reduplication of the ת in pause [Dagesh-forte emphatic, Green, § 24, *c*] after the Masora; comp. Gesen. *Lehrgeb.*, p. 45; Ewald, § 93, *d*.

Ver. 14 seq. **And yet they say unto God, "Depart from us,"** *etc., etc. i. e.*, notwithstanding their prosperity ["the *fut. consec.* וַיֹּאמְרוּ does not here denote temporally that which follows upon and from something else, but generally that which is inwardly connected with something else, and even with that which is contradictory, and still occurring at the same time;" Del.], which should constrain them to gratitude towards God, they will know nothing about Him, yea, they account the service of God and prayer to Him as useless. פָּגַע בְּ, *precibus adire;* comp. Ruth i. 16; Jer. vii. 16; xxvii. 18.

Ver. 16. After the frivolous words of the ungodly Job here resumes his own description, and concludes the section in which he states his proposition.—**Behold, not in their hand stands their prosperity.**—This is not an objection as-

sumed by Job to be made by his opponents, as below in ver. 19 (Schnurrer, Schlottm., Kamph.) [Noyes, Elzas], but an expression of Job's own conviction, who intends herewith to set forth that *not they, but God Himself is in some mysterious way the cause of their prosperity*, by which he would indicate the difficulty of the problem, with which he is here occupied in general. The sentence is not an expression of Job's disapprobation of the view of life prevalent among the wicked (Ewald) [Carey, Wordsworth], for such an expression of disapprobation first appears in *b*, and the position of the words in *a* shows clearly that the main emphasis lies on בְּיָדָם. The interrogative rendering of the clause, "Behold! is not their prosperity in their hand?" (Rashi, Hirzel, Heiligst., Welte, Hahn [Renan]) is contradicted by the use of הֵן לֹא, not הֲלֹא at the beginning. [Moreover the connection with *b* according to such a rendering is strained. —E.] —**The counsel of the wicked be far from me!**—The same formula of detestation recurs in the following discourse of Eliphaz, ch. xxii. 18.—רָחֲקָה מֶנִּי is us d in a precative or optative sense (Ewald, § 223. *b*); it is thus essentially equivalent to the formula elsewhere in use—חָלִילָה לִּי. ["It is the perf. of certainty, which expresses that which is wished as a fact, but with an emotional exclamative accent." Del.]. In respect to עֵצָה, here in the sense of fundamental maxim, disposition, view of life, comp. ch. v. 13; x. 3; xviii. 7. Job thus persists decidedly here again in his refusal in any way to renounce God; comp. ch. i. 11; ii. 5. [This strong repudiation by Job of the practical atheism of the wicked is of especial importance to the moral problem of the book.—E.].

4. *Second Division: Second Half.* Antithetic demonstration of the preceding proposition derived from experience, with reference to the opposite affirmations of the friends, and their possible reproaches.

Fourth Strophe: Vers. 17–21. [The views of the friends in regard to retribution denied both as to the fact and the principle].

Ver 17 involves a reference to certain expressions which Bildad had used in ch. xviii. in justification of his doctrine, particularly to his description of the "extinguishing of the light of the wicked" (ch. xviii. 5), and of the sudden destruction (אֵיד—"prop. pressure of suffering" Del.) of the same (ch. xviii. 12), but only to call in question the correct application of these figures.—**How oft does the lamp of the wicked go out, and their destruction break upon them?**—In Job's mind this "how oft" (כַּמָּה, comp. Ps. lxxviii. 40) is naturally equivalent to "how rarely;" for he decidedly doubts the general correctness of those affirmations of Bildad Moreover the influence of this interrogative "how oft" extends to the third member of the verse [which accordingly is not to be rendered affirmatively, as in E. V., "God distributeth sorrows in His anger"—a rendering which changes the meaning of the entire context, making it an assertion by Job that God *does* punish the wicked as the friends had taught —whereas on the contrary Job is asking how often was this the case?—E.]: (how often) **does He distribute sorrows in His anger?** The subject is God (comp. ch. xx. 23). The particular affirmation of his opponents, to which Job here alludes, is the close of Zophar's last speech (ch. xx. 29), the חֵלֶק of which is distinctly enough echoed here in the יְחַלֵּק. The retrospective reference to this passage would be still more definite if we were to derive חֲבָלִים from חֶבֶל, measuring-line (so the Targ., Ewald, Hirz., Dillmann [Schlott., Renan, Fürst]), and explain it to mean "lots, heritages" (comp. Ps. xvi. 6). It is more natural, nevertheless, (with the LXX. Vulg., Gesenius, Rosenm. [E. V., Good, Lee, Noyes, Ber., Rod., Elz.], *etc.*, to take the word in its ordinary sense = "sorrows, calamities" (plur. of חֵבֶל). ["The plur. does not occur in that tropical sense (of "lots"), and if it were so intended here, חֲבָלֵיהֶם, or חֲבָלִים לָהֶם might at least be expected." Del.]. Also the translation "snares, gins," (Stickel, Hahn, Delitzsch) yields a meaning good in itself, and would have, moreover, the special recommendation of furnishing a retrospective reference to ch. viii. 10-12, the same passage of Bildad's discourse to which *a* and *b* look. The expression—"to distribute snares"—is however altogether too harsh, and the assumption that such an unusual expression is occasioned by the collateral reference to ch. xviii. 10 seq., and to ch. xx. 29, is altogether too artificial.

Ver. 18 (over which the influence of כַּמָּה continues to extend): **How often are they as straw** (chopped straw) [a figure occurring only here: the figure of chaff is more frequent. Del.] **before the wind, and as chaff** (Ps. i. 4; Is. xvii. 13) **which the whirlwind snatches away?** An allusion to Zophar's description, ch. xx. 8, 9, if not as regards the expressions, still as regards the sense.

Ver. 19 "**God lays up his calamity for his** (the wicked man's) **children!**" (אוֹנוֹ from אָוֶן in the signification "calamity;" comp. ch. xi. 11; xv. 35.) [There is possibly a play on the word אונו, which may be rendered either "his wealth," or "his calamity."—His treasure is the coming wrath! און also means "iniquity," and some (E. V., Del., *etc.*) render it so here. Here, however, the "evil" which is the punishment of "evil" best suits the context. —E.] This is an objection of the opponents, which links itself to similar affirmations by Eliphaz (ch. v. 4) and Zophar (ch. xx. 10), and which Job himself here formulates, in order forthwith to refute it: (Rather) **let Him recompense it to him** (or, in view of the emphasis belonging to the word bearing the principal tone: "*to him* let Him repay it") **that he may feel it** (יָדַע here *sentire*, to feel, to be sensible of, as in Is. ix. 8; Hos. ix. 7; Ezek. xxv. 14). In a manner quite similar the prophets Jeremiah (ch. xxxi. 29 seq.) and Ezekiel (ch. xviii.) controvert the similar doctrine of the vicarious expiation of the guilt of parents by their pos-

terity. [Job's view is that retribution can be such only when it falls on the offender himself. It may affect others—although Job does not say that himself—it must reach him. E.]

Ver. 20 continues the refutation of that false theory of substitution or satisfaction, and illustrates at the same time how the evil doer is to ידע or "feel" the divine punishment.—כִּיד "destruction," (lit. "a thrust, blow," *plaga*), only here in the Old Testament; synonymous with the Arabic *caid.* The figure of drinking the divine wrath has immediate reference to Zophar's description, ch. xx. 23. ["The emphasis lies on the signs of the person in עֵינָו and יִשְׁתֶּה. May his own eyes see his ruin; may he himself have to drink of the divine wrath." Del.]

Ver. 21 gives a reason for that which he has just said against that perverted theory by calling attention to the stolid insensibility of the evil-doer, as a consummate egoist, in respect to the interests of his posterity. **For what careth he for his house after him**: lit. "for what is his concern, his interest (חֵפֶץ here, as in ch. xxii. 3; comp. Is. lviii. 3) in his house after him" (*i. e.*, after his death)? אַחֲרָיו is in close union with בְּבֵיתוֹ (comp. *e. g.* Gen. xvii. 19) not with חֶפְצוֹ. **If the number of his months is apportioned to him**; or "while [or when] the number, *etc.*" The whole of this circumstantial clause, which is a partial echo of ch. xv. 20 (comp. ch. xiv. 5), expresses the thought, that the selfish pleasure-seeking evil-doer is satisfied if only his appointed term of life remains to him unabridged. This general meaning may be maintained whether, in accordance with Prov. xxx. 27, we explain חֻצָּץ to mean: "to allot, to appoint," thus rendering it as a synonym of חָצָה (ch. xl. 30 [xli. 6]; so Targ., Gesen., Ewald, Dillm.); or, which is less probable, we take it as a denominative from חֵץ, "arrow," in the sense of "casting lots, disposing of by lot" [from the custom of shaking up arrows for lots—a doubtful sense for the Hebrew] (so Cocceius, Rosenm., Umbreit, Hirzel, *etc.*); or whether, finally, we assign to the word the meaning of "cutting off, completing" (Gesenius in Thes., Stickel, Delitzsch [E. V. Good, Ber., Noy., Schlott., Con., Rod., Ren., Fürst] *etc.*)—to which latter interpretation, however, the expression—"the number of his months"—is not so well suited, for a number is not properly cut off. [In any case the addition of E. V., "when the number of his months is cut off *in the midst*," is erroneous; for even if we assign to the verb the signification—"cut off"—the meaning of the clause is cutting off *at the end*, not in the midst. What is the evil-doer's concern in his house, when he himself is no more? The other meaning given above however—"to apportion"—gives a more vivid representation of his brutal selfishness, his unconcern even for his own flesh and blood, provided he himself have his full share of life and its enjoyments. What careth he for his house after him, if the full number of his own months be meted out to him? E.] The number of חֳצָצוּ is determined by the subordinate [but nearest] term of the subject, by virtue of an attraction similar to that in ch. xv. 20 (Gesen. § 148 [§ 145], 1) [Green, § 277].

Fifth Strophe: vers. 22-26: [The theory of the friends involves a presumptuous dictation to God of what He should do, seeing that His present dealings with men, and their participation of the common destiny of the grave, furnish no indication of moral character].

Ver. 22. **Shall one teach God knowledge.** לְאֵל as containing the principal notion is put emphatically first. In respect to the dative construction of verbs of teaching (as in Greek *διδάσκειν τινί τι*) comp. Ewald, § 283, c.: **Seeing He judgeth those that are in heaven**: lit: "and He nevertheless judges (וְהוּא, circumstantial clause) the high" [Carey: "dignities." The LXX read דָמִים, *φόνους*]. The "high" are simply the heavenly spirits, the angels as inhabiting the heights of heaven (מְרוֹמִים, comp. ch. xvi. 19; xxv. 2; xxxi. 2), not the celestial heights themselves, as Gesenius explains, with a reference to Ps. lxxviii. 69, a reference, however, which is probably unsuitable. Still less does it mean "the proud" (Hahn, Olshausen), a signification which רָם by itself, and without qualification never has. This proposition, that God exercises judicial power over the exalted spirits of heaven, Job advances here all the more readily, that the friends had already appealed twice in similar words to the same fact of the absolute holiness and justice of God (ch. iv. 18, and xv. 15). They had indeed done this with the intent of supporting their narrow-minded doctrine of retribution, while *on the contrary* Job, by the same proposition would put their short-sighted theory to the rout, and direct attention to the unfathomable depth and secresy of God's counsels, and of the principles of His government.

Vers. 23-26 demonstrate this unfathomableness and incomprehensibleness of the divine judgments (Rom. xi. 33) by two examples, which are contrasted each with the other (ver. 23, ver. 25: זֶה־זֶה, "the one—the other"), of one man dying in the fulness of his prosperity, of another who is continually unfortunate, but whom the like death unites with the former, notwithstanding that their moral desert during their life was altogether different, or directly opposite in character. The assumption of many ancient and some modern commentators, as *e. g.* Hahn, that by the prosperous man described in ver. 23 seq. a wicked man, and by the unfortunate man described in ver. 25 a pious man is intended, without qualification, is arbitrary, and hardly corresponds with exactness to the poet's idea. The tendency of the parallel presented is rather in accordance with ver. 22, to show, in proof of the mysteriousness of the divine dealings and judgment, that what happens outwardly to men in this life is *not necessarily* determined by their moral conduct, but that this latter might be, and often enough is directly at variance with the external prosperity.

Ver. 23. **The one dies in the fulness of his prosperity**; lit. "in bodily prosperity," *in ipsa sua integritate.* In respect to עֶצֶם "self" [essence, the very thing] comp. Gesen. § 124

[§ 122], 2, Rem. 3; and in respect to תֹּם, "integrity in the physical sense, bodily, in general external well being," comp. the word מְתֹם generally used elsewhere in this sense, Ps. xxxviii. 4 [3], 8 [7], and also תְּמִימִים Prov. i. 12.—שַׁלְאֲנָן in the second member, which is not found elsewhere is an alternate form of שַׁאֲנָן, "unconcerned," enlarged by the introduction of a liquid [comp. זַלְעָף from זַעַף, *æstuare*, and בַּלְסָם, *βόλσαμον*, from בֹּשֶׂם; Del.]. According to Rödiger, Olsh., it is possibly just an error in writing for שַׁאֲנָן, the form given above in ch. xii. 5. שָׁלֵיו stands here for the more frequent defective form שָׁלֵו, ch. xx. 20; comp. Jer. xlix. 31.

Ver. 24. **His troughs are full of milk**. Most moderns, following the lead of the Talmudic מַעֲטָן "olive-trough," as well as the authority of the Targ. and many Rabbis, take עֲטִינִים correctly in the sense of "vessels, troughs" ["milk-pails," Luther, Wolfsohn, Elzas; "bottles," Lee; "skins," Carey (*i. e.* undressed skins, the abundance of milk making it necessary to use these)], to the rejection of interpretations which are in part singularly at variance, such as "cattle-pastures" (Aben-Ezra, Schult. [Renan, Weymss] *etc.*, "veins" (Fürst), "jugular veins" (Saad.), "sides" (Pesh.) [Noyes, Con.], "bowels" (LXX., Vulg. ["breasts," Targ., E. V.; "loins," Rodwell; "sleek skin," Good. "The assumption that עֲטִינָיו must be a part of the body is without satisfactory ground (comp. against it *e. g.* ch. xx. 17, and for it xx. 11); and Schlottm. very correctly observes that in the contrast in connection with the representation of the well-watered marrow one expects a reference to a rich, nutritious drink." Delitzsch]. The meaning of this member of the verse accordingly reminds us in general of ch. xx. 17, which description of Zophar's Job here purposely recalls, in like manner as in "the marrow of the bones," in *b* he recalls ver. 11 of the same discourse. [**And the marrow of his bones is well-watered**]. In respect to "well-watered," an agricultural or horticultural metaphor, comp. Is. lviii. 11.

Ver. 25. **The other dies with a bitter soul** (comp. ch. iii. 20; vii. 11; x. 1), **and has not enjoyed good**; lit. "and has not eaten of the good" (or "prosperity," טוֹבָה as in ch. ix. 25) with בְּ partitive, as in Ps. cxli. 4; comp. above ch. vii. 13 [אָכַל בְּ perhaps like רָאָה בְ conveying the idea of enjoyment, as Schlottmann suggests. Not, however, of full enjoyment, but rather tasting of it.—Not as in E. V. "and never eateth *with pleasure;*" against which lies (1) The customary usage of בְּ partitive after verbs of eating and drinking; (2) The objective meaning of טוֹבָה, which cannot be taken of subjective pleasure.—E.].

Ver. 26. **Together** [or: **beside one another**] **they lie down in the dust** (of the grave), **and worms cover them**.—רִמָּה, decay, worms, as above in ch. xvii. 14. Comp. our proverbial expressions in regard to the equality of the grave, the impartiality of death, *etc.*

5. *Third Division:* A rebuke of the friends on account of their one-sided judgment touching the external prosperity of men, a judgment which was only unfavorably as regards Job: vers. 27-34.

Sixth Strophe: vers. 27-30.—**Behold I know your thoughts** [מַחְשְׁבוֹת, counsels, plans], **and the plots** (מְזִמּוֹת, *sensu malo*, as in Prov. xii. 2; xiv. 17; xxiv. 8) ["is the name he gives to the delicately developed reasoning with which they attack him": Delitzsch; the schemes which they invent to wound him, the painful dilemmas into which they would entrap him: E.] **with which ye do violence to me**: with the intent namely of presenting me at any cost as a sinner. ["By the construction of חמס with עַל the notion of falling upon and overpowering is indicated." Schlottm.].

Ver. 28, hypothetical antecedent with כִּי, is related to ver. 29 as its consequent, precisely like ch. xix. 28 to ver. 29. [So Ewald. Del., Dillm. But such a construction seems neither natural nor forcible. The causal rendering: "*For* ye say, *etc.*," is simpler and stronger. It was from just such taunts as the following that Job knew their spirit, and detected their insidious plots against his reputation and his peace. The causal rendering is adopted by E. V. Good, Wem., Noy., Words., Schlott., Con., Rod., Carey, Elzas, *etc.* E.]. **If**, [or, **when**] **ye say: "Where is the house of the tyrant?** (נָדִיב, *sensu malo*, as in Is. xiii. 2, not in the neutral sense, as above in ch. xii. 21) [a title of honor, similar in use to our nobleman, *generosus*, for which, in its personal application to Job here, "tyrant" seems too strong a rendering. Neither here, nor in Is. l. c., is such a rendering called for. In this member the prominent idea is station, rank: the moral character of the נדיב is indicated in the following member. E.], **and where the tent inhabited by the wicked?** lit., "the tent of the habitations of the wicked," by which possibly a spacious palatial tent is intended, with several large compartments within it (such as the tents of the Bedouin sheikhs are to this day), which can be recognized from afar by their size. [משכנות "is not an externally, but internally multiplying plur.; perhaps the poet by בית intends a palace in the city, and by אהל משכנות a tent among the wandering tribes, rendered prominent by its spaciousness, and the splendor of the establishment" Del.]. It is to be noted moreover how distinct an allusion there is in the question to the repeated descriptions of the destruction of the tent of the wicked by Eliphaz and Bildad (ch. xv. 34; xviii. 15, 21).

Ver. 29. **Have ye not inquired then** [שְׁאֶלְתֶּם for שְׁאַלְתֶּם; see Green, § 119, 2] **of those who travel**: lit. "the wanderers, passers-by, of the way;" comp. Lam. i. 12; Ps. lxxx. 13, *etc.* ["People who have travelled much, and therefore are well acquainted with the stories of human destinies." Del.]. **And**

their tokens ye will at least not fail to know; *i. e.* that which they have to tell of examples of prosperous evil-doers and righteous ones in adversity (they, who have travelled much, who know about other lands and nations!) that you surely will not disregard, controvert, or reject? תְנַכֵּרוּ, Piel of נכר, expresses here, as in Deut. xxxii. 27: 1 Sam. xxiii. 7; Jer. xix 4, the negative sense of "ignoring, denying," while occasionally, *e. g.* in Elihu's use of it, ch. xxxiv. 19, it signifies also to "acknowledge" (a meaning elsewhere found in the Hiphil). [So here E. V. Lee, Conant, Ewald, Schlott.—according to which rendering the second member is a continuation of the question begun in the first]. אותות, "tokens," means here "things worthy of note, remarkable incidents, *memorabilia*, anecdotes of travel."

Ver. 30 gives in brief compass the substance and contents of these lessons of travel: **That in the day of destruction** (אֵיד, as in ver. 17) **the wicked is spared** (*i. e.* is held back from ruin; חשׂך as in ch. xvi. 6; xxxiii. 18), **in the day of overflowing wrath they are led away**: *i. e.* beyond the reach of the devastating effect of these outbursts of divine wrath (עֲבָרוֹת as in chap. xl. 11), so that these can do them no harm. The Hoph. הוּבַל, which is used below in ver. 32 of being escorted in honor to the grave, expresses here accordingly, in like manner as in Is. lv. 12, being led away with a protecting escort (as, for example, Lot was conducted out of Sodom). [Noyes gives to the verb here the same application as in ver. 32, and explains: He is borne to his grave in the day of wrath; *i. e.* he dies a natural, peaceful death]. The only unusual feature of this construction, which in any case is much to be preferred as a whole to that of Ewald [Rodwell] "on the day when the overflowings of wrath come on" is the לְיוֹם, instead of which we might rather look for בְּיוֹם, "in the day." It is nevertheless unadvisable, in view of the context, to translate the second member—as *e. g.* with Dillman [E. V., Con., Carey]—"they are brought on to the day of wrath;" for such a proposition could not possibly be attributed to the travellers, but at most to the friends; it would thus of necessity follow *a* very abruptly [and unnaturally]; neither would any essential relief be obtained from a transposition of ver. 30 and ver. 29 as suggested by Delitzsch. [Zöckler overlooks, however, the explanation of those (such as Scott, Carey, Conant, Wordsworth, Barnes, *etc.*) who regard the whole of this verse as expressing, through the travellers of ver. 29, Job's own conviction that the wicked are reserved for future retribution, that they are led forth to a day of wrath hereafter; that accordingly present exemption from the penalty of sin proves nothing as to a man's real character. Such an explanation, however, is to be rejected for the following reasons: (1) It is at variance with the drift of the book's argument. (2) It is inconceivable, if Job held so clearly and firmly to the doctrine of future retribution, as this view of the passage before us would imply, that he did not make more use of it in his discussions. (3) It is inconsistent with the connection. (*a*) Why should he produce this view here as a foreign importation? Why should he rest it on experience? Observe that the proposition—the wicked are spared in times of calamity *is* a deduction from experience, for the truth of which Job might well appeal to the testimony of those who by much observation and experience could testify to the fact. But surely the doctrine of a future retribution must rest on other authority—the witness of conscience, the testimony of a divine revelation, the *consensus* of the wise and holy (not merely of the עֹבְרֵי דֶרֶךְ) in all ages and lands. (*b*) It is inconceivable that Job having carried his hearers forward to the retribution of the Hereafter as the solution of the mystery of the present should proceed to speak (as he does in the verses immediately following) of the present prosperity and pomp of the wicked, and of the continuance of the same to and upon the grave, in the same strain as before. Especially does the conclusion reached in ver. 33 seem strange and unsuitable, if we suppose the sublime truth of a full retribution to be declared in ver. 30.—E.]

Seventh Strophe: vers. 31-34. **Who to His face will declare His way? and hath He done aught—who will requite it to Him?** This inquiry evidently proceeds not from the travellers, whose utterance has already come to an end in ver. 30, but from Job himself. Moreover it concerns not the sinner, but God, the unsearchably wise and mighty disposer of men's destinies, whose name is not mentioned from reverential awe. So correctly Aben-Ezra, Ewald, Hirzel, Heiligst., Dillm. Regarded as the continuation of the discourse of the travellers (as it is taken by the majority of commentators) [so Del., Schlott., Renan, Scott, Good, Lee, Bernard, Rod., Words., Elzas, Merx], the verse must naturally be referred to the wicked man, characterizing his unscrupulous arbitrary conduct, which no one ventures to hinder or punish. But for this view the expression מִי יְשַׁלֶּם־לוֹ, "who will requite it to him?" would be much too strong. Moreover a sentiment of such a reflective cast would be strange in the mouth of the travellers from whom we should expect directly only a statement of fact (אותות ver. 29). [Referred to God the meaning would be: Who will challenge the divine conduct? He renders no account of His actions. His reasons are inscrutable; and however much His dealings with men seem to contradict our notions of justice, our only recourse is silence and submission. But against this interpretation it may be urged: (1) It requires too many abrupt changes of subject. Thus we should have for subject in ver. 30 the wicked man, in ver. 31 God, in ver. 32 the wicked again, and this while in ver. 31 and ver. 32 the subject is indicated only by personal pronouns. It is highly improbable that והוּא in ver. 31 *b*, and וְהוּא in ver. 32 *a* are used of different subjects. (2) The expressions are unsuitable to the thought attributed to them, especially the clause מִי יְשַׁלֶּם־לוֹ, which, as Delitzsch argues, used of man in relation to God, has no suitable meaning. On the other hand the application to the

wicked gives a smooth connection, at the same time that the expressions are entirely appropriate to describe his career of lawless impunity. The והוא of ver. 32 moreover acquires by this application its proper emphasis (see on the verse). To the objection made above—that a moral reflection of the sort would be inappropriate in the mouth of travellers, it may be replied that it is *not* properly a reflection, but a statement of fact, the fact, namely, of the evil-doer's exemption from responsibility and punishment. On the contrary, so far from being called to account, or properly punished, he escapes in the day of calamity (ver. 30), he defies the world (ver. 31), and is buried with honor (ver. 32). Carey thinks that Job here "makes evident allusion to a custom that prevailed among the ancient Egyptians, whose law allowed any one to bring an accusation against a deceased person previously to his interment (and even kings themselves were not exempted from this death judgment); if the accusation was fully proved, and the deceased was convicted of having led a bad life, he was obliged to be placed in his own house, and was debarred the customary rites of interment, even though the tomb had been prepared for him." Less simple and probable than the explanation given above. E.]

Vers. 32 seq. continue the report of those who had travelled much, not however (any more than in ver. 30) in their *ipsissimis verbis* strictly quoted, but in such a way that Job fully appropriates to himself that which they say (to wit, their vivid representation of the brilliant career of the wicked), so that accordingly even ver. 31 need not be regarded as properly an interruption of that report. **And he** (וְהוּא pointing back to the רָע ver. 30 [emphatic, according to the view which regards the רָע as also the subject of ver. 31. *He—the same* who lives that lawless, defiant, outwardly successful life, is the favorite of fortune to the very last. Feared in his life, he is again honored in his death. E.] **is borne away to burial**, in full honor, and with a great procession; comp. on ver. 30; also ch. x. 19; xvii. 1. ["Like משכנות above, קברות is also an amplificative plural." Del. It would thus mean "a splendid tomb"]. **And on a monument he** (still) **keeps watch**: as one immortalized by a statue, or a stone monument. This is not to be specially understood in accordance with the Egyptian custom (in that case the reference here being to pyramids; comp. on ch. iii. 14), but in accordance with a custom, still prevalent in the East, specially among the Bedouin Arabs, of building large grave-mounds, or a domed structure towering above the grave (קֻבָּה) in memory of the honored dead. In such a lofty monument the dead man keeps watch, as it were, over his own resting-place, without its being necessary to suppose that he was particularly represented by a statue, or a picture on the wall (like those in Egyptian vaults, to which Schlottm. refers here by way of comparison). ["Possibly there is also here some allusion to inscriptions warning off those who would desecrate the tomb, similar to those found on the sarcophagus of Eschmunazar, king of Sidon." Renan]. This explanation is in striking harmony not only with well-known customs of the east, but also with the etymologically established signification of גָּדִישׁ=heap, *tumulus, monumentum* (comp. גַּל, Gen. xxxi. 46 seq.). It agrees not less with that which was previously spoken by Bildad to precisely the opposite effect in respect to the memory of the evil-doer after his death in ch. xviii. 17, where the latter presupposes the complete extinction of the name of the ungodly, whereas Job on the contrary makes the same not only not to *sleep* the sleep of death, but rather to *watch*, as though he continued to live. [And Noyes accordingly renders: "*Yea, he still survives upon his tomb.* He enjoys as it were a second life upon his tomb, in the honors paid to his memory, his splendid monument, and the fame he leaves behind him."]. The more striking the above points of agreement, the less necessary is it to fatigue ourselves in company with the ancient versions and Böttcher (*Proben, etc.*, p. 22) in finding how גָּדִישׁ could be taken in the sense of "heaps of sheaves," and still obtain a sentiment suited to the context.* Equally unnecessary is it (with Böttcher de infer. p. 40, [Conant], Hahn, Rödiger, *etc.*) to take ישקד impersonally; "watch is held over his grave-mound, *etc.*" a rendering with which the suffix-less גָּדִישׁ (not גְּדִישׁוֹ) would agree but indifferently. ["Moreover," says Delitzsch, "the placing of guards of honor by graves is an assumed, but not proved, custom of antiquity." The rendering of E. V. "and shall remain in the tomb," is feeble as well as incorrect.].

Ver. 33. **Soft lie upon him the clods** [or sods] **of the valley** (ch. xxxviii. 38). Lit., "sweet are to him the clods of the valley," those, namely, beneath which he rests. Valleys are particularly desired in the East as places of burial; witness the valleys around Jerusalem, abounding as they do in graves. The favorite custom of the Arabs of burying their distinguished dead on eminences, is accordingly not referred to here (comp. Del. on ver. 32). ["These words also seem to suppose that the person who is buried may partake, in some respects, of the prosperous state of the tomb which contains him. Such an idea seems to have been indulged by Sultan Amurath the Great, who died in 1450, [and who in the suburbs of Prusa] 'now lieth in a chappell without any roofe, his grave nothing differing from the manner of the common Turks; which, they say, he commanded to be done, in his last will, that the mercie and blessing of God (as he termed it) might come unto him by the shining of the sunne and moone, and falling of the raine and dew of heaven upon his grave.' KNOLLES' *Hist. of the Turks*, p. 332." Noyes]. **And after him draws** (יִמְשֹׁךְ intransitive as in Judg. iv. 6) **all the world**: *viz.* by imitating his ex-

* Witness the following curious effort of Bernard: "[Honored] *as when he watched over his corn-shocks.* Just as in his life-time people were obliged (through their fear of him) to salute him humbly, when they passed before him as he stood watching over his shocks of corn, that no poor man might glean an ear, so must they testify their respect to his body when carried to the grave."

ample, by entering on the same path of a life spent in earthly enjoyment and luxury, which he, and an unnumbered multitude of others before him (as the third member says) had already trod. Thus rendered the sentence undoubtedly expresses an exaggeration; in the כָּל־אָדָם there lies an unjust accusation of misanthropic bitterness against the great mass of men. [For a somewhat similar misanthropic, or at least cynical bitterness, comp. what Bildad says in ch. viii. 19.] This same characteristic however corresponds perfectly to the exasperated and embittered temper of Job; whereas on the contrary to interpret "all the world draws after him" of a large funeral procession (Vaih., [Wemyss, Carey] *etc.*), yields when compared with 32 *a* an inappropriate tautology, and to refer it to those who follow after him through sharing the same fate of death and burial (Delitzsch [Noyes]) seems altogether too vapid in the present connection.

Ver. 34. *Conclusion:* with a reference to ver. 27. **How then** (וְאֵיךְ, *quomodo ergo*, stronger than the simple אֵיךְ) **can you comfort me so vainly** (comp ch. ix. 29)? **Of your replies there remains** (over nothing but) **falsehood!** Lit. "and as for your replies (absolute case, Ewald, § 309, *b*)—there remaineth over falsehood."—מַעַל, scil. בֵּאלֹהִים, "a perfidious disposition towards God" (comp. Josh. xxii. 22), and for that same reason also towards one's neighbor. By this is intended the same intriguing, malicious, deceitful eagerness to suspect and to slander, with which in ver. 27 he had reproached his opponents.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The significance of this discourse of Job's in respect to the progress of the colloquy lies in the fact that it marks *the transition* from the predominantly *personal* treatment of the problem, which has thus far obtained on the part both of the friends and of Job *to a discussion dealing more immediately with the subject-matter, and for that reason more calm, less passionate in its tone, and more directly preparing the way for the solution.* The venomous accusations of the friends, (which in the immediately preceding discourse of Zophar had reached the climax of bluntness and odiousness), do not indeed cease from this point on. Just as little does the tone of bitterness disappear from Job's replies, which on the contrary at the beginning and close of the present discourse exhibits itself in a manner decidedly marked (in vers. 2-3; which contain sarcastic allusions to the empty "consolations of the friends"; in ver. 34, with its reproach of falsehood and unfaithfulness). From this point on however we find, along with these personalities, a tendency, characterized by an ever increasing objectivity, to consider calmly the question of fact involved in the matter in controversy; the result indeed being that Job's superiority over his opponents as regards their respective points of view becomes more and more obvious. In his former discourse he had discussed only occasionally and incidentally their favorite doctrine concerning the horrible end of the wicked; and in what he had said he had exhibited so little prudence that he had appeared as one who presumptuously challenged the divine righteousness, and had thus only confirmed the friends' evil opinion of his moral character (see ch. ix. 22-24; x. 3; xii. 6). Now, however, he proceeds to discuss the question in controversy calmly and thoroughly, opposing to their proposition, that the life of the ungodly must infallibly end in misery, the fact, which experience establishes that it is quite commonly the case that the prosperity of the wicked lasts until their death, while on the contrary the pious are pursued with all sorts of calamities to the grave. In respect to the reflection of an apparent injustice which this experience seems to cast on God, the author of so unequal a distribution of human destinies, Job this time expresses himself with discreet awe and reserve. Instead of assuming the tone of a presumptuous blasphemer, and accusing God of injustice, or tyrannical severity, he treats the contradiction between prosperity and virtue, as it so often exhibits itself in this earthly life, as a dark enigma, not to be solved by human wisdom. And instead of holding up this antagonism before his opponents with frivolous satisfaction or exulting arrogance, he exhibits whenever he approaches the subject deep perplexity and painful agitation (vers. 5, 6), and in the latter part of the description he even points out the mystery which surrounds the phenomenon under consideration as a disciplinary trial for human knowledge, constraining to reverential submission beneath the inscrutable ways of God (vers. 22 and 31, according to the more correct explanation: see above on the passages). In short, he discourses concerning this mystery as an earnest thinker, resolutely maintaining his religious integrity, and putting the counsel of the ungodly far from him (ver. 16); and this calm, earnest, dignified treatment accounts for his victory over his opponents, who as may be seen from the following, which is the last stage of the colloquy, are constrained to acknowledge his affirmations in respect to the disproportion between prosperity and moral worthiness in this life as being in great part true, and thus to make a beginning toward a complete surrender.

2. Notwithstanding this undeniable superiority over his opponents, which Job here already exhibits, his argument presents certain vulnerable points, which expose him to further attacks from them. For in so far as, with manifest one-sidedness, it completely ignores the instances, which occur frequently enough, of a righteous apportionment of men's destinies, and exhibits the instances of the opposite fact, by a process of abstract generalization, as alone of actual occurrence, it does injustice on the one side to the friends, who are thereby indirectly classified with the wicked who are unworthy of their prosperity; while on the other side it becomes an arraignment of God, who is described as though he gave *no* proof of a really righteous retribution, but rather decreed continually examples of the contrary. Indeed in one instance, (vers. 19-21) the speaker seems to be guilty even of formally *teaching God*, in that he here maintains

(in opposition to a familiar application of the theory of retribution set forth in the Law, Ex. xx. 5; Deut. xxiv. 16, an application controverted also by Jeremiah and Ezekiel), that God punishes with justice only where He exacts expiation of the evil-doer himself, and not of his children after him. The consequence that God does not punish where He ought to punish, is but a short remove from this proposition, which is accordingly easily liable to the reproach of speaking unbecomingly of God. The judgment of Job accordingly in the present discourse concerning God and His dealings with men's destinies is the less pure and correct in so far as it in no wise distinguishes between the God of the present, and the God of the future, as we find him doing in ch. xix. 25seq. For this reason, and because the sufferer begins anew to yield to the pressure of his outward and inward sufferings, the hope of a blessed future in the life beyond, which had previously irradiated his misery, is completely obscured.

3. Notwithstanding this partial obscuration of his spiritual horizon, Job in the discourse before us utters much that is beautiful, profoundly true, and heart-stirring. The first discourse pronounced by Job after the inspired pæan of hope in ch. xix. 25seq., there may be discerned in it a certain hallowing influence thence proceeding, which justifies in a measure the remark of Sanctius on that passage: "From this point on to the end of the book Job is not the same as he has been heretofore." His description of the success and abounding prosperity of the ungodly, by its many points of contact with similar moral pictures, such as Ps. xxxvii.; Ps. lxxiii.; Jer. xii. 1seq.; Hab. i. 13seq.; Eccles. vii., *etc.*, commends itself as being perfectly true, and derived from life. Especially does the circumstance that in his observation of the prosperity of the wicked he shows himself continually inclined to restrain himself within the bounds of modesty, and the limitations prescribed by the contemplation of the unsearchable operations of God, give him an indisputable advantage over the description of his opponents (and especially of his immediate predecessor Zophar), which is one-sided in the opposite direction, and for that very reason less true. "The speeches of Zophar and of Job are both true and false,—both one-sided, and therefore mutually supplementary. If, however, we consider further, that Job is not able to deny the occurrence of such examples of punishment, such revelations of the retributive justice of God, as those which Zophar represents as occurring regularly and without exception; that, however, on the other hand, exceptional instances undeniably do exist, and the friends are *obliged* to be blind to them, because otherwise the whole structure of their opposition would fall in,—it is manifest that Job is nearer to the truth than Zophar" (Delitzsch i. p. 425).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 6. ZEYSS: Because reason cannot comprehend the mystery of affliction, and why God often deals so severely with His children, it comes to pass that even in pious hearts mournful thoughts frequently spring up, and they tremble in their great sorrow; Ps. xxxvii. 1; lxxiii. 12; Jer. xli. 1, *etc.*—V. GERLACH: Doubts touching the rectitude of God's government of the world, have in them that which makes our inmost feelings quiver; the thought makes all the foundations of human existence quake.

Ver. 7seq. SEB. SCHMIDT: The happiness of the ungodly is described; and it is shown that they are happy (1) in themselves—ver. 7; (2) in their children—ver. 8; (3) in their houses—ver. 9; (4) in their cattle—ver. 10; (5) in their flocks—ver. 11; (6) in a life which is joyous and merry—ver. 12; (7) in a death which at the last is not sad—ver. 13. WOHLFARTH: What must we bear in mind, in order that we may not err as to God and virtue, when we see the ungodly prosperous, the godly afflicted? If Job recoiled from such a sight, who can blame him, a sufferer sorely tried, and with but imperfect knowledge of God? But a *Christian* can and will guard himself against such doubts; for he knows that according to God's sovereign decree outward prosperity has often no relation to a man's moral worth; that the good things of this world will not long make man happy, and that without a peaceful conscience happiness in this earth is impossible; that frequently the earthly prosperity which the wicked enjoy is the means of their punishment; that the place of retribution is not yet in this world; and that God, whose counsels we cannot penetrate, will notwithstanding assuredly compensate pious sufferers for their earthly losses.

Ver. 22 seq. STARKE: In holy fear we should wonder at God's judgments; but we should by no means sit in judgment upon them, nor inquire after the reason of His conduct; Is. xlv. 9. V. GERLACH: The righteous and the ungodly have both their various destinies, but these have nothing to do with their position before God; there lies another mystery behind which our short-sighted speeches and thoughts cannot unveil.

Ver. 27 seq. STARKE (after Osiander and the Tübingen Bible): The ungodly are often highly exalted in order that afterwards their fall may be so much the greater. Although in this world, occupying high places, they do evil without terror, and are punished by nobody, there will come nevertheless a day of judgment, when their wickedness will be brought to view, and before all the world they will be put to shame.

THIRD SERIES OF CONTROVERSIAL DISCOURSES.

THE ENTANGLEMENT REACHING ITS EXTREME POINT.

CHAPTERS XXII—XXVIII.

I. Eliphaz and Job: Chapter XXII—XXIV.

A.—Eliphaz: Reiterated accusation of Job, from whose severe sufferings it must of necessity be inferred that he had sinned grievously, and needed to repent:

CHAP. XXII. 1–20.

1. The charge made openly that Job is a great sinner:

VERS. 1–10.

1 Then Eliphaz the Temanite answered and said:

2 Can a man be profitable unto God,
as he that is wise may be profitable unto himself?
3 Is it any pleasure to the Almighty that thou art righteous?
or is it gain to Him that thou makest thy ways perfect?
4 Will He reprove thee for fear of thee?
will He enter with thee unto judgment?
5 Is not thy wickedness great?
and thine iniquities infinite?

6 For thou hast taken a pledge from thy brother for nought,
and stripped the naked of their clothing.
7 Thou hast not given water to the weary to drink,
and thou hast withholden bread from the hungry.
8 But as for the mighty man, he had the earth:
and the honorable man dwelt in it.
9 Thou hast sent widows away empty,
and the arms of the fatherless have been broken.
10 Therefore snares are round about thee,
and sudden fear troubleth thee.

2. Earnest warning not to incur yet severer punishments:

VERSES 11-20.

11 Or darkness, that thou canst not see;
and abundance of waters cover thee.
12 Is not God in the height of heaven?
and behold the height of the stars, how high they are!
13 And thou sayest, How doth God know?
can He judge through the dark cloud?
14 Thick clouds are a covering to Him, that He seeth not;
and He walketh in the circuit of heaven.
15 Hast thou marked the old way,
which wicked men have trodden?

16 Which were cut down out of time,
whose foundation was overflown with a flood;
17 which said unto God, Depart from us:
and what can the Almighty do for them?

18 Yet He filled their houses with good things:
but the counsel of the wicked is far from me
19 The righteous see it, and are glad
and the innocent laugh them to scorn:
20 "Whereas our substance is not cut down,
but the remnant of them the fire consumeth."

3. **Admonition to repent, accompanied by the announcement of the certain restoration of his prosperity to him when penitent:**

VERSES 21-30.

21 Acquaint now thyself with Him, and be at peace:
thereby good shall come unto thee.
22 Receive, I pray thee, the law from His mouth,
and lay up His words in thine heart.
23 If thou return to the Almighty, thou shalt be built up,
thou shalt put away iniquity far from thy tabernacles.
24 Then shalt thou lay up gold as dust,
and the gold of Ophir as the stones of the brooks.
25 Yea, the Almighty shall be thy defence,
and thou shalt have plenty of silver.

26 For then shalt thou have thy delight in the Almighty,
and shalt lift up thy face unto God.
27 Thou shalt make thy prayer unto Him, and He shall hear thee,
and thou shalt pay thy vows.
28 Thou shalt also decree a thing, and it shall be established unto thee:
and the light shall shine upon thy ways.
29 When men are cast down, then thou shalt say, There is lifting up;
and He shall save the humble person.
30 He shall deliver the island of the innocent;
and it is delivered by the pureness of thine hands.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Without controverting Job's position in ch. xxi., that the present life furnishes numerous examples of the prosperity of the ungodly, and of calamity to the pious, but at the same time without abandoning in the slightest degree his former argument in favor of an external doctrine of retribution, Eliphaz adheres to his assumption that the cause of Job's calamities and misery could lie only in sins of a grievous character (vers. 2-10), with which he now reproaches him particularly and in detail (vers. 6-9),—sins of arrogance, of cruelty, and of injustice towards his neighbor. Then follows an earnest warning against pursuing any further his unholy thoughts and speeches, as otherwise his final doom, like that of all the wicked from the earliest times must be a terrible one (vers. 11-20)—a position indeed which Job also might urge to prove the alleged injustice of God's treatment of him. To this sharp warning succeeds a conciliatory invitation to repent and to return to God, and to enter into possession of the blessings promised by God to the penitent, the whole discourse having a conclusion similar to that of the first discourse of Eliphaz (vers. 21-30) This third and last discourse of Eliphaz falls into three divisions, exactly equal in length, and each of these embraces two strophes substantially equal in length, consisting of five verses each (the first, however, only of four).

2. *First Division, or Double Strophe:* the accusation: vers. 2-10.

First Strophe: vers. 2-5: Four interrogative sentences, which taken together exhibit a well-constructed syllogism, of which the first two questions (vers. 2, 3) constitute the major premise, the third (ver. 4) the minor, the fourth (ver. 5) the conclusion. The major premise expresses the thought: The cause of Job's misery cannot lie in God, the All-sufficient One, to whom the conduct of men, whether good or evil, (wise or unwise) matters nothing. The minor premise affirms that the penalty which Job was enduring could not have been brought upon him by his piety. From this he draws a conclusion unfavorable to Job's moral character. **Is a man** [גֶּבֶר, "a great man, a hero, *etc.;* man in short considered in his best estate;" Carey] **profitable unto God? Nay, the intelligent man is profitable unto himself.** The question, with its negative force, and the negative follow each other immediately, the latter introduced by כִּי in the sense of "nay, rather" [Conant: "for;" E. V. Wemyss, Elzas, less suitably; "as," regarding the second clause as a part of the question]. The meaning is: God, the absolutely Blessed One, who has everything and needs nothing, receives no advantage from

man's conduct. whether it be thus or so, whether he act unwisely, (*i. e.* wickedly, Ps. xiv. 2 [1], or intelligently (*i. e.* piously, righteously); so that accordingly if the latter is the case, man cares only for his own well-being. In regard to סכן, lit. "to dwell beside one another, to become one's neighbor," and hence "to assist one another, to be serviceable, to be profitable," comp. above on ch. xv. 3; also xxxv. 3. The pathetic plural form עָלֵימוֹ, with the signification of the singular, עָלָיו, as in ch. xx. 23. [The use of עַל in the second member, instead of לְ as in the first, is one of the Aramaisms, "which poetry gladly adopts" (Del.). Comp. Ps. xvi. 6].

Ver. 3. **Is it an advantage to the Almighty, if thou art righteous?** חֵפֶץ [lit. "pleasure"] means here, as the parallel בֶּצַע in the second member shows, "interest, gain, advantage," as in ch. xxi. 21. **Or a gain, if thou behavest blamelessly?** lit. "if thou makest thy ways blameless" [or "perfect"] (תַּתֵּם, imperf. Hiph. of תמם, with the [Aramizing] doubling of the first radical; comp. Gesen. § 66, Rem. 8), *si integras facias vias tuas.* The meaning of the whole question is: God gets no profit from men's righteousness; consequently the motives which determine him to inflict sufferings on men are neither selfish, nor arbitrary.

Ver. 4. **Will He because of thy godliness** [lit. "fear, godly fear"] **chastise thee, enter into judgment with thee?** That is: if now then the cause of such a calamity as has befallen thee lies in thyself, can it be thy piety for which God punishes thee? Hirzel interprets מִיִּרְאָתְךָ to mean: "from fear of thee," the suffix expressing the genit. of the object against the context, which requires a meaning antithetic to רעתך, ver. 5. [Hirzel's explanation is the one adopted also by Bernard, Wemyss, Carey, Renan, Rodwell, Elzas]. The meaning: "godly fear, piety" is all the more firmly established for יראה by the fact that Eliphaz has already used this same word twice in this emphatic sense: chap. iv. 6 and chap. xv. 4 ["a genuine Eliphazian word, in accordance with the poet's method of assigning favorite words and habits to his speakers." Ewald].

Ver. 5. The conclusion, expressed in the interrogative form, like the preceding propositions in the syllogism. **Is not thy wickedness great, and no end of thy transgressions?**—Thus strongly does Eliphaz accuse Job here; for, entangled in legalism, he thinks that if the impossibility that God should cause the innocent to suffer be once for all firmly held, then, from the severity of the sufferings inflicted on any one, we may argue the greatness of the transgressions which are thus punished,—a piece of bad logic, seeing that it entirely overlooks the intermediate possibility which lies between those two extremes, that God may inflict suffering on such as are friends indeed, but not yet perfected in their piety, with a view to their trial or purification.

Second Strophe: Vers. 6–10. Enumeration of a series of sins, which, seeing that they are ordinarily associated with riches and power, must constitute, in the opinion of the speaker, the probable reason why Job, who was once rich and honored, had fallen so low, and been made to suffer the Divine chastisement.

Ver. 6. **For thou didst distrain thy brethren without cause**—*i. e.*, without being in thy superfluity under any necessity of doing so (Hirzel). The brethren are naturally the next of kin, fellow-clansmen, not specially brethren in the more literal sense. If instead of אַחֶיךָ we should with many MSS. and Editions (so also Bähr and Delitzsch) read אָחִיךָ, this singular form, "thy brother," would nevertheless require to be understood as a collective, as the second member shows. **And the clothes of the naked thou didst strip off.**—By עֲרוּמִּים we are to understand, of course, not those who are absolutely naked, but those who are scantily clothed, the half-naked poor, as in Isa. xx 2; John xxi. 7; James ii. 15 (comp. also Seneca, *De Beneficiis,* v. 13: *si quis male vestitutum et pannosum videt, nudum se vidisse dicit*). To strip such "naked" ones by distraint of their last piece of apparel is forbidden not only by the law of Moses (Ex. xxii. 25 seq.; Deut. xxiv. 6, 10 seq.), but also by the sentiment of universal humanity. The same may be said of the proofs of cruelty enumerated in the following verse [ver. 7: **Thou gavest no water to the fainting to drink, and thou didst refuse bread to the hungry**]; comp. Isa lviii. 10, and for the opposite course Matt. x. 42.

Ver. 8. **And the man of the fist** (absolute case)—**his was the land, and the honored one was to dwell therein!**—That is to say, according to the insolent, selfish, grasping views and principles which Eliphaz imputes to Job. The "man of the arm," or "of the fist" (אִישׁ זְרוֹעַ), *i. e.*, the powerful and violent man, as well as "the honored man" (נְשׂוּא פָנִים, as in Isa. iii. 3; ix. 14), is none other than Job himself, the proud, rich Emir, who, as Eliphaz maliciously conjectures, had driven away many of the poor and helpless from house and home, in order to seize upon the land far and wide for himself. According to the assumption that both expressions referred to another than Job, whom the latter had favored in his course of self-aggrandizement (Rosenmüller, Umbreit, Hahn [Noyes, Wemyss, Renan, Elzas—who translates: "As if the land belonged to the man of power alone; as if only the man of rank may dwell therein"]), the strong sense of the pass ge is needlessly weakened. That Job is not immediately addressed here, as in the verse just preceding, and again in the verse following, is to be explained by the vivid objectivizing tendency of the description.

Ver. 9. **Widows thou didst send away empty—when they came to thee as suppliants; and the arms of the orphans were broken**—in consequence, namely, of the treatment which such needy and helpless ones were wont to receive from thee and those like thee. The discourse here assumes the objective generalizing tone, for the reason that Eliphaz is sen-

sible that the concrete proofs of the charge which he would be able to produce out of Job's former history would be all too few! The "arms of the orphans" is a figurative expression describing not their appeal for help, but all their powers and rights, all upon which they could depend for support. The same phrase—דכא זרעות—occurs also in Psalm xxxvii. 17; Ezek. xxx. 22. For the "arms" as the symbol of strength, power, comp. ch. xl. 9; Psalm lxxvii. 16 [15]; lxxxiii. 9 [8].

Ver. 10. **Therefore snares are round about thee** (a figure descriptive of destruction as besetting him around; comp. ch. xviii. 8-10), **and terror suddenly comes upon** [or **affrights**] **thee** (comp. Prov. iii. 25)—*i. e.*, sudden deadly anguish, terror in view of thy approaching complete destruction, overpowers thee time after time. Comp. the similar description above in Bildad's discourse, ch. xviii. 11. ["To be noted is the frequent paronomasia of פח and פחד." SCHLOTT.].

3. *Second Division, or Double Strophe:* the warning. If Job should presumptuously cast doubt on the Divine righteousness, and thereby make himself partaker of the sins of those in the primeval world who insolently denied God, he would draw down on himself the Divine judgment which had been ordained for those guilty of such wickedness, and which would without fail overtake them, however long and securely they might seem to enjoy their prosperity: vers. 11-20.

Third Strophe: vers. 11-15. **Or seest thou not the darkness, and the flood of waters, which covereth thee?**—That is, dost thou not then perceive in what destruction thou art already involved, and that in punishment for thy sins? "Darkness" and the "flood of waters" (the multitudinous heaving of waters, שִׁפְעָה as in Is. lx. 6) are here, as also in ch. xxvii. 20, a figure not of the sins of Job (Hahn), but of the night of suffering and of the deep misery, which, as Eliphaz thinks, had come upon him in consequence of his sins. תְּכַסֶּךָּ is a relative clause, and logically belongs also to חֹשֶׁךְ; comp. Is. lx. 2. In mentioning darkness and a flood as bursting on Job, he has reference to the catastrophe of the deluge, which in the following verses he proceeds to hold up as a warning picture of terror (ver. 16). The whole verse forms a suitable transition from the accusation in the preceding section to the warning which now follows. [By the majority of versions and commentators ver. 11 is joined immediately to the verse preceding, as its continuation. There is certainly a close connection between the two. But that Zöckler (after Dillmann) is correct in regarding ver. 11 as transitional to what follows, and so introducing the next strophe, is favored both by the use of the disjunctive אוֹ rather than וְ, and by the evident anticipation of ver. 16 in the שִׁפְעַת־מַיִם. This view requires the construction of חשך as the object of לֹא תִרְאֶה: "seest thou not the darkness?" (Ewald, Schlottm., Dillm., Delitzsch), rather than as an independent subject, followed by a relative clause: "darkness, that thou canst not see" (E. V., Umbreit, Noyes, Con., Lee, Renan, Rodwell, *etc.*).—E.]

Ver. 12. **Is not Eloah the height of heaven?** *i. e.* the heaven-high, infinitely exalted One (comp. ch. xi. 8; [in view of which passage, says Schlottmann, the construction of גבה שמים as *Accus. loci:* "in the height of heaven," is less probable than the construction as predicate]).—**And see now the head of the stars** (*i. e.* the highest of the stars, כּוֹכָבִים *gen. partitivus*) **how high they are!**—כִּי "how," or also "that," as in Gen. xlix. 15; 1 Sam. xiv. 29. The plural רָמּוּ [by attraction] as in ch. xxi. 21; comp. Ewald, § 317, *c*. The whole verse, in this reference to the Divine greatness and exaltation, beginning as a question, and passing over into a challenge, has for its object the vindication of Him who is above the world, and above man, against every thought which would limit His knowledge, or cast any suspicion on the perfect justice of His ways.

Ver. 13 seq. The doubt expressed by Job touching the justice of God in administering the affairs of the world is here interpreted by Eliphaz as a denial *that God has any knowledge of earthly things*, or feels any special concern in what happens to men. He therefore reproaches him with holding that erroneous, and almost atheistical conception of the Deity, which has since been advanced by the Epicureans (see *e. g.* Lucretius III. 640 seq.), and more recently by the English Deists. ["Eliphaz here attributes to Job, who in ch. xxi. 22 had appealed to the exaltation of God in opposition to the friends, a complete misconception of the truth, and thus skilfully turns against Job himself the weapon which the latter had just sought to wrest from him." Schlottmann]. **And so thou thinkest** (literally "sayest") **what knows God?** (or: what should God know?) **will He judge through** (בְּעַד as in Gen. xxvi. 8; Joel ii. 9) **the darkness of the clouds?**—*i. e.* judge us men on this lower earth, from which He, covered by the clouds, is wholly separated and shut off.

Ver. 14 continues this symbolical description of this total separation of God from the world: **Clouds are a covering to Him, so that He sees not** (comp. Lam. iii. 44), **and He walks upon the vault** (or "circle," Prov. viii. 27; Is. xl. 22) **of the heaven**—not therefore on this earthly world, which is too small and insignificant for Him. Similar expressions of unbelief touching God's special concern for the affairs of earth may be found *e. g.* in Ps. lxxiii. 11; xciv. 7; Is. xxix. 15; Ezek. viii. 12.

Ver. 15. **Wilt thou keep in the path of the old world?** (שָׁמַר, to observe, follow, as in Ps. xviii. 22 [not "hast thou marked"? E. V. against which is the fut. תִּשְׁמוֹר, and the connection] and אֹרַח עוֹלָם, as in Jer. vi. 16; xviii. 15), **which the men of wickedness trod?** *i. e.* insolent, ungodly and wicked men, as they are described in the following verses, both as to their arrogant deeds, and their righteous pun-

ishment. The reference to the race of men immediately preceding the Noachian deluge (the ἀρχαῖος κόσμος of 2 Pet. ii. 5) is evident enough.

Fourth Strophe: vers. 16-20. Description of the destruction of those ungodly men as a divine judgment overtaking them after a season of prosperity, together with an application to the controversy suggested by Job's case in respect to the doctrine of retribution.

Ver. 16. [The asterisk in the Hebrew Bible marks the verse as the middle of the book, there being 537 verses before, and the same number after this mark] **Who were swept off** (קֻמְּטוּ, lit. "were seized" comp. above on ch. xvi. 8) [Bernard, Rodwell, *etc.*, "who became shrivelled (corpses) before, *etc.*" Carey: "who got tied up . . . so that escape was impossible," but better as above,—"to be snatched away"] **before the time**—*i. e.* before there was any probability, according to human experience, that their hour had come; comp. the ἄωροι of the LXX. also above in ch. xv. 32 בְּלֹא יוֹמוֹ—as even in the present passage some Mss. read בְּלֹא instead of וְלֹא (com. Ps. cxxxix. 16). **As a stream their foundation was poured away**—*i. e.* it became fluid, so that they could no longer stand on it, but sank down. Again a palpable allusion to the deluge (scarcely to the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, in mentioning which the rain of fire and brimstone (Gen. xix. 24; comp. Job xviii. 15) would scarcely have been forgotten:—against Ewald [and Davidson, *Introd.* ii. 229]). The construction of the words which we have followed, according to which יְסוֹדָם is the subject, נָהָר nominat. of the predicate or product, and יוּצַק descriptive Imperf. Hoph. (not an unusual alternate form of the Perf. Pual יֻצַּק, as Ewald supposes) appears as that which alone is favored by the position of the words and the accents. The following renderings are not so good: "their place became a poured out stream" (Hirzel: "whose foundation was a poured out stream" (Umbr., Olsh.) [Rodwell]; "a stream was poured out upon their foundation" (Rosenm., Hahn) [Lee, Carey: with which may be connected the rendering of E. V. Renan, Noyes, Elzas: "whose foundation was overflown with a flood," and of Conant: "their foundation was poured away in a flood"].

Ver. 17. **Who said unto God: Depart from us! and what could the Almighty do for them?**—The sentiment of the ungodly is expressed first in the direct and then in the indirect form of speech, precisely as in ch. xix. 28. As to the matter the passage reminds us of Job's last discourse, ch. xxi. 14, 15. The same arrogant God-renouncing utterances, which Job there attributes to the prosperous wicked described by him, is here imputed by Eliphaz to the objects of his description, in order to show to him that up to a certain point he agrees entirely with his representation of the relation of external prosperity to human sinfulness. ["El. no doubt intends this as a direct contradiction to Job's statement. The Patriarch had asserted that men of these atheistical principles were happy all their lives. El. says: No! these are the very sort of men who were visited by the judgment of the deluge, and you are just as bad as they, for you are treading in their steps." Carey].

Ver. 18. **And yet he had filled their houses with blessings**—(טוֹב, prosperity, good, as below ver. 21 and ch. xxi. 25 טוֹבָה); a circumstantial clause, which stands connected with the principal verb in ver. 16, having a restrictive force, in order to express the contrast between the sudden judgment which overtakes the wicked, and the long season of prosperity preceding it, which gives to them the appearance of exemption from punishment. The formula of detestation which follows in *b* Eliphaz intentionally takes as it were out of the mouth of Job (comp. ch. xxi. 16), in order to impress upon him that only he has the right thus to speak who does not doubt that God inflicts righteous retribution.

Ver. 19. **The righteous will see it**:—to wit the destruction which will one day befall the wicked (not the punishment inflicted on the sinners of the primeval world, which was long since past)—**and rejoice, and the innocent will mock at them**—at those who were once prosperous, but have now encountered the righteous penalty of their transgressions, in regard to whom accordingly the proverb will be verified—"he laughs best who laughs last." The triumphant joy of the righteous over the final punishment of the ungodly, which they shall live to see, and which Eliphaz here describes in such a way as to contrast with Job's previous utterances, ch. xvii. 8; xxi. 5, 6, is frequently described in the Old Testament; comp. Ps. lviii. 11 [10] seq.; lxiv. 10 [9] seq.

Ver. 20 contains the words in which this future triumph of the pious will be expressed. **Verily** (אִם־לֹא as in ch. i. 11; xvii. 2) **our adversaries are destroyed.** קִימָנוּ (instead of which Olsh. needlessly proposes קָמֵינוּ after Ps. xliv. 6; Ex. xv. 7) is a pausal form for קִימֵנוּ, from a root קִים, which occurs only here, meaning "he who is set up" (partic. pass.), *i. e.* the adversary. The righteous designate the ungodly as their adversaries not in a personal, but an ethical sense, because God's enemies are also their enemies; comp. Ps. cxxxix. 21; Rom. xi. 28. **And what is left to them a fire has devoured** יִתְרָם, "their remnant, their residue," to wit, in property and wealth; the remainder of their means; hardly "their super-abundance" (Del.) ["for why should the fire devour only that which they had as a superfluity?" Dillm.] יִתְרָם is used here accordingly in another sense than in ch. iv. 21, a passage otherwise similar to the present. For the use of *fire* as a symbol of the divine decree of punishment effecting a radical extermination, comp. ch. xv. 34; xx. 26; Ezek. xx. 28, *etc.*

4. *Third Division, or Double Strophe:* vers. 21-30: An admonition to repentance, and a promise of salvation to the penitent.

Fifth Strophe: vers 21-25: The admonition.

Ver. 21. **Make friends now with Him,**

and be at peace. הַסְכֶּן here with עִם, which gives a signification different from that found above in ver. 2, *viz.* "to make friends with any one, to draw nigh to any one," comp. James iv. 8. The following וּשְׁלָם is to be rendered as an Imperat. consec. (comp. Prov. iii. 4; and Gesen. § 130 [§ 127], 2; "and be at peace, *i. e.* "and so shalt thou be at peace." ["We distinguish best between הסכן and שלם by regarding the former as expressing the conclusion, the latter the preservation of peace." Schlottmann]. **Thereby shall blessing come to thee**—come upon thee, comp. ch. xx. 22. תְּבוֹאַתְךָ (instead of which many Mss. read תְּבוֹאָתְךָ) is 3 sing. fem. imperf. with a doubled indication of its feminine form (first by ת and afterwards by ־ָה), hence=תָּבֹאָה. with suffix of the 2d person. Comp. in regard to such double feminines Delitzsch on the passage [who refers to Prov. i. 20; Ezek. xxiii. 20; Josh. vi. 17; 2 Sam. i. 26; Amos iv. 3], also Ewald § 191, *c;* 249, *c* [Green § 88, 3 *f.*]—Olsh. and Rödig. following certain Mss. would read תְּבוּאָתְךָ: "thereby will *thine income* be a good one." but this would impart to the discourse an artificial character, seeing that an earthly reward is not mentioned before ver. 25 seq. As to בָּהֶם, "thereby" (lit. "by these things") with neuter suffix, comp. Ezek. xxxiii. 18; Is. lxiv. 4; xxxviii. 16.

Ver. 22. **Receive, I pray, instruction out of His mouth.**—God's mouth represented as the source of instruction in the higher truth, as in Prov. ii. 6 [El. as Dillm. says claiming to be himself the interpreter of God's teaching to Job].

Ver. 23. **If thou returnest to the Almighty.**—(שׁוּב עַד as in Joel ii. 12; Am. iv. 6 seq; Is. xix. 22) ["We are told by Rosenmüller that עַד stands here for אֶל *to*, but we are rather inclined to think with Maimonides that it is purposely made use of in its real signification, *viz.*, *as far as*, *even to*, *right up to*, *close up to*, in order to encourage Job, who was looked upon by the speaker as a very great sinner, by showing him that notwithstanding the enormities of his sins, he need not despair of coming through penitence again *close up* to his offended Creator." Bernard. Or, as Carey says, that his return must be no partial movement, "not one that would stop half way, but a return quite to God"]. **If thou removest iniquity far** (puttest it far away) **from thy tents.**—This second conditional clause, being parallel to the antecedent clause in *a*, needs no apodosis. It adds to the former a more specific qualification, which in itself indeed is not necessary, but which is appropriately illustrative of the former; comp. ch. xi. 14. The LXX, who in the first member read תְּעַנֶּה (*καὶ ταπεινώσῃς*) instead of תִּבָּנֶה construed the whole verse as the antecedent, vers. 24, 25 as parenthetic, and ver. 26 as consequent—a dragging construction, which indeed has a parallel in ch. xi. 13-15, but has less to justify it here in the sense and connection. [The E. V. in making the last clause a part of the apodosis—"thou shalt be built up, thou shalt put away, *etc.*," does not quite correctly set forth the logical relation of the clauses. E.]

Ver. 25. **And lay down in** (or **cast down to**) **the dust the precious ore.**—The word בֶּצֶר, which occurs only here and in the following verse, signifies according to the etymology as well as the connection precious metal, gold or silver, and that in its crude, unprepared state, as it is brought forth out of the shafts of the mountain mines, hence "gold and silver ore," "virgin-gold" (Delitzsch). The "laying down of such metal in the dust" signifies that one relieves himself of it as of worthless trash. The second member expresses the same thought still more strongly. **And among the pebbles of the brooks** (בְּצוּר assonant with בֶּצֶר) **the gold of Ophir.**—אוֹפִיר for the more complete and common כֶּתֶם אוֹפִיר, comp. ch. xxviii. 16; Ps. xlv. 10 [9], *etc.*, also such modern mercantile abbreviations as Mocha, Damask, Champagne, *etc.* In regard to the much disputed location of the land of Ophir (LXX. Ὠφείρ,—Cod. Al. however Σωφείρ, which reminds us of Sufâra, on the peninsula of Guzerat, in India, as well as of the Coptic Sofir, used as a name for India) comp. the Realwörterbücher [Cyclopædias and Dictionaries]; also Bähr on 1 Kings x. 22 [Vol. VI. of this series, p. 122]. To the earlier theories which located Ophir in India, or in Arabia has been added latterly that of Sir Rod. Murchison, who in a Report to the London Geographical Society is inclined to the opinion that the south-African coast around the mouth of the Limpopo river is the true Ophir of the Bible, supporting his view in part by the conjectures of the well-known archæologist, John Crawford (in his Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands), which point to this locality, and in part by the discoveries of districts abounding in gold, which the German traveller, K. Mauch, claims to have made since 1866 in this very region (north of the colony of Natal). Comp. the *Ausland*, 1868, No. 39: *Die Goldfünde in der Kolonie Natal und das Ophir der Bibel*—which essay indeed rightly prefers the combinations of K. Ritter, Chr. Lassen, *etc.* pointing to the East Indies, while an article in the "*Globus*," Vol. 18, No. 24, p. 369 seeks to mediate between the two hypotheses by supposing Ophir to be "a wild region on the Indian Ocean, which embraced a part of the eastern coast of Africa and of the western coast of India."

Ver. 25. Apodosis. **Then will the Almighty be thy treasure** (בְּצָרִים, pl. of בֶּצֶר, hence lit. "pieces of gold ore, pieces of metal") **and silver in heaps to thee**—scil. "will He be."—תּוֹעָפוֹת which occurs elsewhere only in Num. xxiii. 22; xxiv. 8; and Ps. xcv. 4, has received very different explanations. According to these passages, however, it must signify "things standing out high and prominent" Here, therefore it must mean either "high *heaps* of silver," or "long, prominent *bars* of silver." The former definition is favored by the fact that the Arabic certifies for יעף the signification, "to tower, to grow, to mount upward," a meaning which the

Vulgate expresses here also (*argentum coacervabitur tibi*), while on the contrary the derivation of the word from the root יָפַע, "to shine" (comp. the LXX: *καθαρὸν ὥσπερ ἀργύριον πεπυρωμένον*), or even from יָעֵף, "to be weary" (Gesen. in Thes., Böttcher [Con. "silver sought with toil"] *etc*), has but slight etymological foundation. In regard to the sentiment in vers. 24-25 comp. New Testament parallels; like Matth. vi. 20, 33; xix. 21; Luke xii. 33; 1 Tim. vi. 16-19, *etc.* [The rendering of these two verses (24, 25) by the E. V. is to be rejected as inconsistent with the language (thus שִׁית־עַל־עָפָר cannot be "to lay up as dust"), and as yielding a much feebler sense.—E.]

Sixth Strophe: vers. 26-30: Further expansion of the promise annexed to the admonition.—**Yea, then shalt thou delight thyself in the Almighty.**—כִּי־אָז confirmatory, as in ch. xi. 15: or argumentative—"for then," *etc.*, which is the common rendering. For the representation of God as the object of joy or delight on the part of the righteous comp. Ps. xxxvii. 4; Is. lviii. 14. In regard to "lifting up the face" as an expression of freedom from the consciousness of sin (the opposite of נָפְלוּ פָנִים, Gen. iv. 6), comp. above ch. xi. 15.

Ver. 27. **If thou prayest to Him,** *etc.*—תַּעְתִּיר hypothetical antecedent without אִם, as also תִּגְזַר in the following verse. As to הַעְתִּיר to pray (lit. "to present incense"), comp Ex. viii. 4 [8], 25 [29]; x. 17. In respect to "discharging," *i. e.* "fulfilling" vows (here most naturally such as have been offered in connection with prayer), see Ps. xxii. 26 [25]; l. 14; lxi. 6 [5], 9 [8]; lxv. 2 [1]. Comp. v. Gerlach on this passage (below in the Homiletical Remarks).

Ver. 28. **If thou purposest anything, so shall it come to pass to thee.**—גזר lit. "to cut off," here as an Aramaism in the sense of "to purpose, determine." אֹמֶר, either=דָּבָר "a matter, anything," or "design, plan" (Del.). As to קוּם, "to come to pass, to be realized," comp. Is. vii. 7; Prov. xv. 22; in respect to "light upon thy ways," see ch. xix. 8.

Ver. 29. **When they lead downwards**—*viz.* thy ways (as to הִשְׁפִּיל, "to make low, to lead downwards," comp. Jer. xiii. 18), **then thou sayest—Upward!**—גֵּוָה, syncopated form of גַּאֲוָה (Ewald § 62, *b;* 73, *b*), lit. "uplifting;" here as an interjection, meaning—"upward! arise!" not, however, as a petition in a prayer (Dillm., *etc.*), but as a triumphant exclamation in thanksgiving. [This rendering is certainly not free from objection, especially on account of the artificial cast which it seems to give to the expression. The rendering of E. V., however: "when *men* are cast down, then thou shalt say, *etc.*," is still less satisfactory, destroying as it does the connection between the first and second members, leaving two verbs, הִשְׁפִּילוּ and יוֹשִׁעַ, with subjects unexpressed, and introducing in *a* a thought which is scarcely suited to this connection, and which is subsequently introduced with climactic force in 30 *b.*—E.] **And to the humbled one** (*i. e.,* to thee, if thou art humbled; lit. "to him who has downcast eyes," LXX.: *κύφοντα ὀφθαλμοῖς*) **He works out deliverance;** *i. e.*, God, who is also the subject of the first member in the following verse. It is not necessary therefore with the Pesh. and Vulg. to read the passive יִוָּשַׁע.

Ver. 30. **He will rescue him that is not guiltless, and** (yet more!) **he is rescued by the pureness of thine hands** (בֹר כַּפֶּים as in ch. xvii 9; Ps. xviii. 21 [20]; xxiv. 4); *i. e.*, on account of thine innocence, which thou shalt then have recovered, God will be gracious even to others who need an atonement for their sins. So great and transcendent an efficacy does Eliphaz assume that Job's future conversion will possess, without once anticipating that he (together with Bildad and Zophar) will turn out to be the not-guiltless one" (אִי־נָקִי for אֵין־נָקִי, Ewald, § 215, *b*) [Gesen., § 149, 1], whom God will forgive only on Job's account; comp. ch. xlii. 8. [Another striking example of that dramatic irony in which our author from time to time indulges, when he allows for a moment the light of the future to fall on his characters in such a way as to present the contrast between their thoughts and God's thoughts.—E.] Seb. Schmidt and J. D. Michaelis have already given the correct explanation, as follows: *Liberabit Deus et propter puritatem manuum tuarum alios, quos propria innocentia ipsos deficiens ipsos deficiens non esset liberatura.* So also substantially most moderns, while Hirzel arbitrarily understands by the not-guiltless one Job, with another subject for the second member. Umbreit, however, gives a still harsher construction, taking Job as the object of the first member (=אִי־נָקִי), and at the same time as subject of the second member, which he treats as addressed to God: "yea, he (Job) is delivered by the pureness of *Thy* hands;" *i. e.*, by Thy Divine righteousness. [E. V., in taking אִי in its usual meaning of "island," gives a rendering which is seen at once to be altogether unsuitable.—E.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Eliphaz in the second part of this new discourse is prompted to discuss *somewhat* more thoroughly than before the proposition advanced by Job (ch. xxi.) touching the frequent contradiction between the moral desert and the outward lot of men, which he does indeed only by representing the prosperity of the wicked, the existence of which he cannot deny, as only apparent, and quickly passing away (vers. 15–20). Following upon this discussion, which has in it little that is personal, and which concerns itself rather with the subject-matter, he resumes the tone of fatherly admonition and persuasion by promises of good found in his first discourse, instead of continuing the purely threatening tone of the second (ch. xv.), closing even with a prophetic picture so full of light, that it quite rivals in the freshness and glow of its colors that found at the close of the first discourse (ch. v. 17 seq.), and breathes a spirit which certainly proves him to be in his way Job's sincere

well-wisher. In all these particulars, and to this extent, Eliphaz, the oldest of Job's friends and their leader, here at the beginning of the third act of the colloquy exhibits *progress for the better in his way of thinking*—a progress, moreover, to which Job himself contributes by the skill with which he vindicates himself, and the moral superiority of his spirit. On the other hand, however, it must be said that he is guilty of misunderstanding and of misrepresenting in a one-sided manner Job's doubts resulting from the disproportion between human desert and happiness (vers. 13, 14), and so perverts them, as though Job had advanced frivolous epicurean conceptions of the Deity, and thus denied a special Providence, leaving the destinies of men on earth to be ruled over by accident. In close connection with this gross misconception of Job's opinions, and serving to explain it, is the re-affirmation which he makes in the First Division through the medium of a downright syllogism (vers. 2–5) of grievous crime on the part of Job as the ground of his sufferings, proceeding so far even as to name particular sins of which he arbitrarily assumes him to be guilty, and pushing his charges to the most outrageous excess (vers. 6–9). In both these respects we see an advance on the part of the speaker in an evil direction, an increasing bitterness, a constant stubborn refusal to entertain the truth. We accordingly find in this discourse in one direction certainly an apparent preparation for a peaceful solution and harmonious reconciliation of the conflict; but in another direction, and that the very one which is important and decisive, it simply contributes to the heightening of the conflict, and by inciting Job to bitterness, makes it more and more impossible for the sorely tried sufferer to enter upon a truly calm and convincing exhibition of the goodness of his cause, and thus points with a necessity which ever becomes more and more imperative, to the final intervention of a higher Arbiter as the only way of unraveling the entangled coil of the controversy.

2. In consequence of this advance both in a good and an evil direction, this new discourse of Eliphaz bears in a much higher degree than his two former ones the character of a peculiar double-sidedness, and self-contradiction in its expressions. Considered in itself it is "the purest truth, expressed in the most striking and beautiful form; but as an answer to the speech of Job the dogma of the friends itself is destroyed in it, by the false conclusion by which it is obliged to justify itself to itself" (Delitzsch). In one respect its expressions breathe the spirit of a genuine prophet, of a divinely enlightened teacher of wisdom of the patriarchal age. But in another respect, in that, namely, which concerns the sharply malicious tendency which they reveal against Job, they seem like the sayings of a false prophet, and even of a passionate accuser and spiteful suspecter of suffering innocence. They have a double sound to them, like the expressions of one who is at once a Moses and a Balaam. "According to their general substance these speeches are genuine diamonds; according to their special application they are false ones" (Delitzsch).—Eliphaz gives utterance to the purest and most elevated conceptions of God, and His infinitely wise and righteous dealings. At the very beginning of the first division he describes His blessed all-sufficiency; at the beginning of the second His heaven-high exaltation, His majesty comparable to the unchangeable brilliancy of the stars; and in the third division he sets forth with incomparable and truly impressive power His fatherly gentleness and compassion, which willingly hears the prayer of the penitent sinner. And what he affirms in respect to the inexorable rigor with which the justice of the same God inflicts punishment, as it was manifested in judgment upon the sinners of the primeval world, upon the ungodly antediluvians (vers. 15-18), even that produces an impression all the more deep and forcible in that it has for its setting those splendid descriptions radiating forth their mild brilliancy. Yet after all that inviting description of the divine all-sufficiency is used in the service of a low, external and vulgar theory of retribution, which is deduced from it by an audacious sophism, and an unexampled logical leap (see on ver. 5). After all that admonitory reference to the majestic movement of God as the All-seeing Ruler of the universe, and the inexorable Avenger of the wicked, shoots wide of the mark in so far as it is aimed at Job, for it was neither true that Job had denied the special Providence and Omniscience of God (as Eliphaz in vers. 13, 14, by a crafty process of deduction, reproached him with doing), nor that his sins were of such a character that they could even approximately be compared with those of the insolent blasphemers and deniers of God in Noah's time. Finally, the beautiful words of promise in the closing division, with their reference to God's goodness as Father, and with their counsel to seek the love of this God as the most precious of all treasures (vers. 24, 25), are wanting in all true power of consolation for Job, and lose entirely their apparent value in consequence of that which precedes them. For if Job is to seek God as his heavenly treasure, it is presupposed that hitherto he has loved earthly treasures more than was right, nay, that he has been guilty of the sins and transgressions of grasping tyrants, as was intimated in the first division (vers. 6–9). And if Job had really sinned so wantonly, and subscribed to the atheistic sentiments of the generation that was destroyed by the deluge, then all advice to repent and return to the Heavenly Father would be for him practically useless; at least from the stand-point of Eliphaz, characterized as it was by the pride of legal virtue, such an exhortation, together with the promise of good which accompanied it, could scarcely have been uttered sincerely. [Should we not, however, make allowance for the perplexing dilemma in which the friends found themselves placed? Was there not a constant strife between the deductions of their logic and the instincts of their affection? Is it strange that the rigor of the former should be continually qualified by the tenderness of the latter? And does not our poet skillfully avail himself of this inconsistency to relieve what would otherwise be the intolerable harshness of their position?—E.]

3. This two-fold character appertaining to the utterances of Eliphaz, it is evident, increases largely the difficulty of the homiletic expounder of this chapter, especially if he would not simply seize upon and bring forth single pearls or gems, but consider the beautiful glittering jewel as a whole. For in order to a correct appreciation, and a truly fruitful application of the contents of the discourse, which is not wanting in richness, it is indispensable to avoid as much as possible any mutilation of so well-connected a whole, and to note everywhere not only what is true, but also what is false and one-sided in the utterances of the speaker. The Moses and the Balaam sides of the prophet must be exhibited together. Any other treatment, any one-sided favorable representation of the speaker's character would contradict the evident purpose of the poet, which is from the beginning to the end of this discourse to present truth and error blended and amalgamated together. This is especially indicated by the circumstance that Eliphaz at the close of the discourse appears wholly in the character of a pseudo-prophet, of the order of Balaam, and is compelled unwillingly to prophesy the issue of the controversy, and that too as one that is decidedly unfavorable to him and his associates. "He who now, considering himself as נָקִי, preaches penitence to Job, shall at last stand forth אִי נָקִי, and will be one of the first who need Job's intercession as the servant of God, and whom he is able mediatorially to rescue by the purity of his hands" (Delitzsch—comp. above on vers. 29, 30).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 2 seq. Brentius: This is indeed a most beautiful exhortation to repentance which Eliphaz here delivers; but what is it to Job? Eliphaz therefore sins in this direction, because that by these words he falsely charges Job with iniquity and impiety, and this with no other reason for so doing than that he sees him to be afflicted. . . . Everything is well said, but carnally understood. For carnal wisdom thinks that in this life blessing attends the godly in temporal affairs, but a curse the ungodly; whereas truth teaches that in this life, to the godly, the blessing accompanies the curse, life death, salvation damnation; while, on the contrary, to the ungodly, the curse accompanies the blessing, death life, damnation salvation.

Ver. 6 seq. Starke (after the Tübingen Bible and Zeyss): To withhold a pledge which has been received, and to oppress the poor, are heinous sins, which cry out to heaven (Ex. xxii. 26 seq.). To sin against the widows, the orphans, the poor, the needy, *etc.*, infallibly brings down severe punishment from God, as One who has His eye specially on those, Sir. xxxv. 18 seq.

Ver. 12 seq. Cocceius: It is an old error that God dwells in the highest summit of heaven, and touches those things which are lower only by a certain force impressed on those things which are nearest to Himself, and gradually transmitted from them;—an error which Scripture refutes when it says that God is a God at hand, and not a God afar off (Jer. xxiii. 23 seq.), for no part of creation is nearer to God than any other.—Wohlfarth: "God is too exalted to trouble himself about the affairs of men:" thus do many still think, and walk accordingly in the path of unbelief, sin and destruction. Only the Tempter can persuade them to this. Just *because* God is the most exalted Being, nothing is hidden from Him; and He knows even our most secret actions, our most hidden wishes, our most silent sufferings (Jer. xxiii. 23 seq.; Ps. cxxxix. 1 seq.; Matt. vi. 8; 1 John iii. 20, *etc.*).

Ver. 17 seq. Starke: As it is the wish and longing of the godly, that God would draw nigh to them, so, on the contrary, the burden of the song of the ungodly is: "Depart from us!" *They would gladly leave to God His heaven, if He would only leave to them their earthly pleasure.*—God oftentimes seeks to allure the wicked to repentance by multiplying their earthly possessions; if, however, He does not succeed in this, it results only in their heavier condemnation. When they think that they are most firmly established, God suddenly casts them down, and brings them to nought (Ps. lxxiii. 19).

Ver. 19. Wohlfarth: May *the Christian* also rejoice in the destruction of sinners? Eliphaz, in accordance with the way of thinking in his time, speaks of the pleasure of the righteous when sinners are seized by the hand of the Lord. *Christ* wept in sight of Jerusalem over its hardened inhabitants, and said: "How often," *etc.* (Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xix. 42 seq.). . . When, therefore, the Lord blesses the righteous, rejoice, O Christian! but do not mock at the sinner, but save him when thou canst do it (James v. 19, 20),—when not, mourn for him as thy brother, whose fate demands pity.

Vers. 23-25. Starke: What sin tears down, God's grace builds up again. Having this, you are rich enough! The world's treasure and comfort are silver and gold, empty and perishable things; but the children of God's only, highest, and best portion is God Himself (Ps. lxxiii. 25 seq.).—V. Gerlach: If thou dost cling with the heart to God, thou canst throw away thy gold, or lose it without concern; the Almighty still remains thy perennial treasure; whereas, on the contrary, *without Him* the most laborious cares and watchings avail nothing.

Ver. 27. V. Gerlach: The paying of the vows, which is elsewhere presented more as a duty, appears here as a promise: God will ever grant thee so much, that thou shalt be able to fulfill all thy vows!

Ver. 30. Jo. Lange: The intercession of a righteous man is so potent with God, that on account of it He spares even evil-doers, and visits them not with punishment (Gen. xviii. 23 seq.; Ezek. xiv. 14 seq.).

B.—Job: Seeing that God withdraws Himself from him, and that moreover His allotment of men's destinies on earth is in many ways most unequal, the incomprehensibleness of His ways may hence be inferred, as well as the short sightedness and one-sidedness of the external theory of retribution held by the friends.

CHAP. XXIII—XXIV.

1. **The wish for a judicial decision of God in his favor is repeated, but is repressed by the thought that God intentionally withdraws from him, in order that He may not be obliged to vindicate him in this life.**

CHAP. XXIII.

1 Then Job answered, and said:

2 Even to-day is my complaint bitter:
my stroke is heavier than my groaning.
3 O that I knew where I might find Him!
that I might come even to His seat!
4 I would order my cause before Him,
and fill my mouth with arguments.
5 I would know the words which He would answer me,
and understand what He would say unto me.

6 Will He plead against me with His great power?
No; but He would put strength in me.
7 There the righteous might dispute with Him;
so should I be delivered forever from my judge.
8 Behold I go forward, but He is not there;
and backward, but I cannot perceive Him;
9 on the left hand where He doth work, but I cannot behold Him;
He hideth Himself on the right hand that I cannot see Him.

10 But He knoweth the way that I take:
when He hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold.
11 My foot hath held His steps,
His way have I kept, and not declined.
12 Neither have I gone back from the commandment of His lips;
I have esteemed the words of His mouth more than my necessary food.
13 But He is in one mind, and who can turn Him?
and what His soul desireth, even that He doeth.

14 For He performeth the thing that is appointed for me:
and many such things are with Him.
15 Therefore am I troubled at His presence:
when I consider, I am afraid of Him.
16 For God maketh my heart soft,
and the Almighty troubleth me.
17 Because I was not cut off before the darkness,
neither hath He covered the darkness from my face.

2. **The darkness and unsearchableness of God's ways to be recognized in many other instances of an unequal distribution of earthly prosperity, as well as in Job's case.**

CHAP. XXIV.

1 Why, seeing times are not hidden from the Almighty,
do they that know Him not see His days?

2 Some remove the landmarks;
they violently take away flocks, and feed thereof.
3 They drive away the ass of the fatherless,
they take the widow's ox for a pledge.
4 They turn the needy out of the way;
the poor of the earth hide themselves together.

5 Behold, as wild asses in the desert,
go they forth to their work, rising betimes for a prey:
the wilderness yieldeth food for them and for their children.
6 They reap every one his corn in the field:
and they gather the vintage of the wicked.
7 They cause the naked to lodge without clothing,
that they have no covering in the cold.
8 They are wet with the showers of the mountains,
and embrace the rock for want of a shelter.

9 They pluck the fatherless from the breast,
and take a pledge of the poor.
10 They cause him to go naked without clothing,
and they take away the sheaf from the hungry;
11 which make oil within their walls,
and tread their wine-presses, and suffer thirst.
12 Men groan from out of the city,
and the soul of the wounded crieth out:
yet God layeth not folly to them.

13 They are of those that rebel against the light;
they know not the ways thereof,
nor abide in the paths thereof.
14 The murderer rising with the light
killeth the poor and needy,
and in the night is as a thief.
15 The eye also of the adulterer waiteth for the twilight,
saying, No eye shall see me:
and disguiseth his face.
16 In the dark they dig through houses,
which they had marked for themselves in the daytime:
they know not the light.
17 For the morning is to them even as the shadow of death:
If one know them, they are in the terrors of the shadow of death

18 He is swift as the waters;
their portion is cursed in the earth:
he beholdeth not the way of the vineyards.
19 Drought and heat consume the snow waters:
so doth the grave those which have sinned.
20 The womb shall forget him; the worm shall feed sweetly on him;
he shall be no more remembered;
and wickedness shall be broken as a tree.
21 He evil entreateth the barren that beareth not:
and doeth not good to the widow.

22 He draweth also the mighty with his power:
he riseth up, and no man is sure of life.
23 Though it be given him to be in safety, whereon he resteth;
yet his eyes are upon their ways.
24 They are exalted for a little while, but are gone
and brought low; they are taken out of the way as all others,

and cut off as the tops of the ears of corn.
25 And if it be not so now, who will make me a liar,
and make my speech nothing worth?

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Instead of replying directly to the injurious accusations of Eliphaz in ch. xxii. 6 sq.; Job here recurs first of all to the wish which he has already uttered several times (especially in chs. ix and xiii.), that God Himself might manifest Himself as Umpire and as Witness of his innocence, and so end authoritatively the controversy which in each successive stage was becoming more and more involved. This wish is, however, immediately repressed by the thought that God purposely keeps Himself removed from him, in order to make him drink the cup of his sufferings to the dregs (ch. xxiii.). And in connection with the mournful fact that *his* state is so cheerless and so full of suffering, and furnishes living proof that God withholds the exercise of His retributive justice, he arrays forthwith (in the second and longer division of his discourse, ch. xxiv.), numerous facts of a similar character, which may be observed in the sphere of human life in general. In particular he sets forth many examples of the prosperity of the wicked, continuing to extreme old age, or even to the end of life. He dwells with evident satisfaction on his description of these examples, in order in this way to establish and illustrate most fully the incomprehensibleness of the divine ways.—The whole discourse, apart from the two principal divisions, which coincide with the customary division by chapters, is divided into smaller strophes of four verses each (in one case of five) in accordance with the strophe-divisions of Ewald, as well as of Stickel and Delitzsch, which in the present case are entirely in harmony.

2. *First Division.* Repetition of the wish, heretofore uttered, that God might appear to rescue and to vindicate him, together with a self-suggested objection, and an expression of doubt whether the wish would be realized: ch. xxiii.

First Strophe: Vers. 2–5. **Even to-day my complaint is still bitter.**—Both the authority of the Ancient Versions, such as the Targ., Pesh., Vulg. [E. V.], and also the comparison with former passages, such as ch. vii. 11; x. 1, favor the view that מְרִי signifies "bitterness," and is thus synonymous with מַר, the possibility of which is shown by the cognate radical relation of the verbs מרה and מרר, which occasionally interchange forms; comp. Delitzsch on the passage. If we take the word however in its ordinary signification of "frowardness, perverseness," we get a suitable meaning: "my complaint is still ever froward" (ever bids defiance, maintains its opposition), *i. e.*, against such exhortations to penitence as those of Eliphaz (or in opposition to God, as Hahn, Olshausen, *etc.*, explain). On the other hand we can make no use of the reading of the LXX.: ἐκ τῆς χειρός μου (מִיָּדִי), nor yet of Ewald's conjecture derived from it—מִיָּדוֹ, "by reason of His hand is my complaint" [so Copt. and Merx].—**My hand lies heavy on my groaning:** *i. e.*, I am driven to the continuous outbreak of my groaning, I must all the time force forth groans (not: my hand thrusts down my groaning, forces it back: Hirzel). Since this rendering yields a meaning that is entirely suitable, and suffers from no particular difficulty as to the language, it is unnecessary either with the Targ. [E. V.], to understand יָדִי of "the hand of God which strikes me" (the suffix ־ִי *sensu obj.*) or (with the LXX. and Pesh.) [Merx] to read יָדוֹ. (According to E. V., Ges., Ber., Noyes, Schlottm., Ren., Rod., עַל is comparative: "the hand upon me is heavier than my groaning," which gives a suitable meaning, at least if we take מְרִי in the sense of bitterness. The objection to it is, however, as stated by Delitzsch, that "כברה יד על is an established phrase, and commonly used of the burden of the hand upon any one, Ps. xxxii. 4 (comp. ch. xxxiii. 7; and the connection with אֶל, I Sam. v. 6, and שָׁם, I Sam. v. 11").—E.]. It remains to be said that the clause defining the time, גַּם הַיּוֹם, "even today," belongs to both halves of the verse, and for the same reason it expresses the more general sense, "even now, even always," (comp. ch. iii. 24). The supposition that the colloquy had lasted several days, and that in particular the present third course of the same had begun one day later than the one preceding is scarcely admissible on the strength of their expression, which is certainly not to be pressed too far, (against Ewald, 2d Ed., and Dillmann).

Ver. 3. **Oh that I but knew how to find Him.**—The Perf. יָדַעְתִּי with the following Imperf. consec. (וְאֶמְצָאֵהוּ) expresses the principal notion contained in Job's wish: *utinam scirem (locum ejus), et invenirem eum = utinam possim invenire eum!* Comp. the similar construction in chap. xxxii. 22; also Gesen., § 142, (§ 139), 3, *c.* The rendering of Dillmann: "Oh that I, having known (where He is to be found), might find Him," (in accordance with Ewald, § 357 *b*) gives essentially the same sense.—תְּכוּנָה in the second member means by itself, a frame, stand, setting up;" here specifically, "seat, throne," *i. e.*, the *judgment* seat of God, as the sequel shows.

Ver. 4. In regard to עָרַךְ מִשְׁפָּט, *causam instruere*, comp. ch. xiii. 18; in regard to תּוֹכָחוֹת (lit. "objections, reproofs") in the specific sense of "legal arguments, grounds of justification," see Ps. xxxviii. 15 [14]; also above ch. xiii. 3.

Second Strophe: Vers. 6–9. The doubt as to the possibility of such a protective interposition of God, begins again to appear. This (ver. 6) takes first of all the form of a shrinking reflection on the crushing effect which God's majesty and infinite fulness of power might easily exert upon him; a thought which has already emerged twice before (ch. ix. 34; xiii. 21), and which in

this place Job, supported by the consciousness of his innocence, repudiates and tramples under foot. **Would He in omnipotence then contend with me? Nay! He would only regard me**: *i. e.*, only give heed to me (יָשִׂים, *scil.* לֵב; comp. ch. iv. 20; here in union with בְּ to express the cleaving of the Divine regard to him, comp. פָּנָה בְּ, ch. vi. 28): only grant me a hearing, and as the result thereof acquit me. [אַךְ, "nothing but;" intensive; the very thing that He would do, hence the thing that He would assuredly do]. To render the Imperfect verbs יָרִיב and יָשִׂים as expressive of a wish: "shall He contend with me?" *i. e.*, shall I wish, that He would contend with me? (Hirzel, Ew., Dillm., *etc.*), is altogether too artificial, and not at all required by the connection. [The E. V., Bar., Carey, supply "strength" (כֹּחַ) after יָשִׂם: God, so far from using His power to crush Job, would strengthen him to plead his cause. But the ellipsis of לֵב is already justified by ch. iv. 20, and the antithesis thus obtained between *a* and *b* is more direct and natural.—E.].

Ver. 7. **Then** (שָׁם as in ch. xxxv. 12; Ps. xiv. 5; lxvi. 6, and often in a temporal sense; then, when such a judicial interposition of God should take place) **would a righteous man plead** (lit., "be pleading," נוֹכָח, partic.) **with Him**: *i. e.*, it would be shown that it is a righteous man who pleads with him; **and I should forever escape my Judge**; *i. e.*, by virtue of this my uprightness. פִּלֵּט is, like מִלֵּט ch. xx. 20, intensive of Kal.

Vers. 8, 9. The joyful prospect is suddenly swept away by the thought that God is nowhere, in no quarter of the world to be found.—**Yet** (הֵן, "yet behold," in an adversative sense, as in ch. xxi. 16) **if I go eastward, He is not there,** *etc.* קֶדֶם ("toward the front, = toward the east") and אָחוֹר (toward the rear, = toward the west," comp. ch. xviii. 20), refer to the eastern and western quarters of the heavens, even as the following "left" and "right" refer to the northern and southern.—**If He works northward, I behold** (Him) **not; if He turns southward I see it not.** שְׂמֹאול, "toward the left" is an adverbial local clause, qualifying בַּעֲשֹׂתוֹ, as also יָמִין, qualifying יַעְטֹף. The former verb expresses its customary meaning: "to work, to be active, efficient," which suits here very well (comp. ch. xxviii. 26), so that every different rendering, as *e. g.*, taking עָשָׂה = עָשָׂה דֶרֶךְ, "to take His way" (Blumenfeld), or = "to hide Himself" (Umbreit), or = עָטָה, "to incline Himself, to turn Himself" (Ewald), seems uncalled for. On the other hand the common signification of עטף—"to veil Himself," is less suitable in *b* [so E. V., Lee, Con., Ber., Rod., Elz., *etc.*], than the signification "bending, turning aside" adopted by Saadia, Schultens, Ewald, Delitzsch, *etc.*, after the Arabic. If this latter definition deserves here the preference, there is the less probability that the passage contains any reference to the חַדְרֵי תֵמָן, ("the chambers of the South," ch. ix. 9), or, generally speaking, to any celestial abode of God as set forth in heathen theologies or cosmogonies. Rather does the poet conceive of God as omnipresent, as much so as the poet of the 139th Psalm, in his similar description (vers. 8-10). [Gesenius and Carey translate *b*: "He veileth the South, *etc.*," but less appropriately, the construction of יָמִין being evidently the same with שְׂמֹאול, which is unquestionably adverbial.—E.]

Third Strophe: vers. 10–13. The reason why God withdraws Himself: *although* He knows Job's innocence, He nevertheless will not abandon His purpose, once formed, not to allow Himself to be found by Him. ["He conceals Himself from him, lest He should be compelled to acknowledge the right of the sufferer, and to withdraw His chastening hand from him." Delitz.]

Ver. 10. **For He knows well my accustomed way.**—דֶּרֶךְ עִמָּדִי, lit. "the way with me," *i. e.*, the way which adheres to me, which is steadfastly pursued by me (comp. Ps. cxxxix. 24; Ew., § 287 *c*), or: "the way of which I am *conscious*" ["which his conscience (συνείδησις) approves (συμμαρτυρεῖ)"], as Delitzsch explains, referring to ch. ix. 35; xv. 9.—**If He should prove me** (בְּחָנַנִי, an elliptical conditional clause; comp. Ewald, § 357, *b*), **I should come forth as gold**, *i. e.*, out of His crucible; a very strong and bold declaration of his consciousness of innocence, for which Job must hereafter (ch. xlii. 6) implore pardon.

Ver. 11. **My foot hath held firm to His step** (אחז, as elsewhere תָּמַךְ, Ps. xvii. 5; Prov. v. 5) ["The Oriental foot has a power of grasp and tenacity, because not shackled with shoes from early childhood, of which we can form but little idea." Carey]: **His way I have kept, and turned not aside.** אַט, Jussive Hiph. from נטה, in the intransitive sense of *deflectere*, as in Ps. cxxv. 5; Is. xxx. 11.

Ver. 12. **The commandment of His lips—I have not departed from it.**—הֵמִישׁ, intransitive, like הִטָּה in the verse preceding. In regard to the construction (antecedent placing of a nominative absolute) comp. ch. iv. 6. **More than my** (own) **law I have observed the saying of His mouth**; have accordingly set them far above all that I have, of my own will, desired or prescribed for myself. [Bernard explains the preposition מ here to mean: "by reason of my rule," *i. e.*, by reason of my having made it a rule. This however obscures the striking contrast between חֻקִּי and אִמְרֵי־פִיו.—E.]. With חֻקִּי we may compare the "law in the members" warring against the Divine law, Rom. vii. 23. [E. V. takes חֻקִּי, as in Gen. xlvii. 22; Prov. xxx. 8, in the sense of one's "allowance of food;" Ewald also translates by "Gebühr" ("that which as a distinguished rich man I have the right to require in my relations to other men, and my claims upon them"). The consideration of Job's greatness and power should be borne in mind with the rendering

"law." The "law" which Job had ever held subordinate to the Divine precepts was the will of a prince.—E.]. צָפַן "to lay up, preserve," is here substantially equivalent with שָׁמַר, comp. Ps. cxix. 11; in view of which parallel passage it is not necessary with the LXX. instead of מֵחֻקִּי to read בְּחֵיקִי, *ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου ἔκρυψα ῥήματα αὐτοῦ.*

Ver. 13. **Nevertheless He remaineth** (ever) **the same, and who will turn Him**: *viz.*, from His purpose; comp. ch. ix. 12; xi. 10. וְהוּא בְאֶחָד, not: "He remaineth by one thing" (Hirzel, Del.) [Lee, Noyes, Carey], for this would have been expressed by the neuter form בְּאַחַת (comp. ch. ix. 22); but the בְּ is ב *essentiæ* (Gesen. § 154 [§ 151] 3, *a*), and the thought expressed is that of the unchangeableness, the constancy of God (not the oneness, or the absolute superiority of God, as the Vulg., Targ., Starke, who refers to Gal. iii. 20, Schultens, Ewald, Schlottmann, [Ges., Ber., Rod., Elz.] explain, but against the context. With *b* compare the well-known expression: "He spake, and it was done, *etc.*," Ps. xxxiii. 9. [The unchangeable purpose of God of which Job here speaks is evidently the purpose to inflict suffering on him, a purpose to which He inflexibly adheres, notwithstanding He knows Job's integrity, and finds through His crucible that the sufferer is pure gold.—E.].

Fourth Strophe: vers. 14-17. **Truly** (כִּי as in ch. xxii. 26), **He will accomplish my destiny.** חֻקִּי, with suffix of the object, means here that which has been decreed, ordained concerning me. **And much of a like kind is with Him**—*i. e.*, "has been determined by Him, lies in His purpose," (comp. ch. ix. 35: x. 13, xv. 9). The "much of that kind" spoken of refers not specifically to Job's sufferings (Umbreit, Delitzsch, *etc.*), as rather to all that is analogous thereto, to all decrees of a like character regarding men in general.

Ver. 15. **Therefore do I tremble** (lit. "I am terrified, troubled") **before His face; if I consider it, I am afraid before Him.** אֶתְבּוֹנֵן is an elliptical hypothetical antecedent, as is the case in ver. 10 *b*. We are to supply as the object to be considered the unfathomable decree of God, by virtue of which he must suffer.

Ver. 16. **And God hath made my heart faint** [lit. "soft"] (הֵרַךְ Hiph. from רָךְ, Deut. xx. 3, *etc.*), **and the Almighty has confounded me.** The emphasis rests in the subjects אֵל and שַׁדַּי, which are purposely placed first in both members. It is *God Himself*, who by His incomprehensibly harsh and stern treatment has plunged him in anguish and terror; *his suffering* considered *in itself* by no means exerts such a crushing influence upon him (see the vers. following).

Ver. 17. **For I am not dumb before the darkness, nor yet before myself whom thick darkness has covered**—*i. e.*, the darkness of my calamity (comp. ch. xxii. 11), and my own face and form darkened and disfigured by my sufferings (comp. ch. xix. 13 seq.) are not able to strike me dumb (with horror); only the thought of God can do this, who with His incomprehensible decree stands behind this my suffering! Observe the significant contrast between the מִפְּנֵי־חֹשֶׁךְ of this ver. and the מִפָּנָיו of ver. 15 *a*; as well as moreover the antithetic relation, which obtains between this passage and the statement of Eliphaz in ch. xxii. 11 that Job seemed not to mark at all the terrible darkness of his misery. Either of these retrospective references of the passage is lost sight of if, with most of the ancients (LXX., Vulg., Luth.) [E. V. Ges., Scott, Noyes, Ber., Ren., Rod., Elz.] we render: "because I was not cut off (נִצְמַתִּי, *deleri, perire*, as in ch. vi. 17) before the darkness came, and He has not covered the darkness from my face" [*i. e.*, has not covered me in the grave, so that I might never have faced this suffering]. The signification: "to become dumb, to be brought to silence," is the only one that is suitable here; we should then have to think (with Delitzsch, *etc.*) of an *inward* destruction by terror and confusion.

3. *Second Division:* ch. xxiv. An extended description of the many incomprehensible things in what God does as ruler of the universe, beginning with the many instances in which He permits the innocent and defenceless to be oppressed and persecuted by their powerful enemies: vers. 1-12.

Fifth Strophe: vers. 1-4. **Why are times not reserved by the Almighty?**—*i. e.* times of reckoning with good and evil; *judicial terms*, at which He displays His retributive justice. In regard to the use of צָפַן, "reserving" [storing up] in the sense of "appointing, fixing," comp. ch. xv. 20; xxi. 19. The question is of course so intended as to require no answer, or a negative one. So also in the second member: **and do His friends** (lit. "His *knowers*" [acquaintances], they who are His, who know Him, and He them, comp. ch. xviii. 21; Ps. xxxvi. 11 [10]) **not see His days?**—The "days" of God here are His judgment days, the days in which He reveals Himself in judicial rigor against his enemies, and in beneficent mercy toward His holy ones (comp. Ezek. xxx. 3, also the expression, the "days of the Son of Man" in Luke xvii. 22). This verse also seems to contain a retrospective reference to the last discourse of Eliphaz, especially to ch. xxii. 19; by the ancients, moreover, who were troubled more particularly about the עִתִּים, "terms, judicial periods," it was variously misunderstood, and erroneously translated. [The construction adopted by E. V., Con., *etc.*: "Why, seeing times are not hidden from the Almighty, do they that know Him not see His days?" is a less natural and simple rendering of the original than that given above. Conant objects that "this question is not pertinent here. The point of inquiry is not, why are such times of retribution not appointed by God; but why, if they are appointed by Him, as alleged, do not good men witness them?" Job however does deny, by implication, that there is any retribution, or time reserved for it, with the Almighty. The phenomena of human life, he argues, indicate that God cares not how men sin, or suffer. The

second member of the verse puts the thought of the first in a still more striking light. The indications of retributive justice in the administration of the world, are such that not even God's familiars, who are in His secret. can discern the days whereon they occur.—E.].

Ver. 2. **Landmarks they remove** [or, are removed; vb. impersonal] **flocks, they plunder, and feed.** From this point on begins the specific description of the many deeds of violence, oppression and persecution permitted by God. The vers. immediately following (3, 4) describe the wicked agents who commit such deeds, vers. 5-8 the wretched ones who suffer from them, and thence on interchangeably, now the persecutors and now the persecuted, the verbs used being put in the 3d person plural Perfect. In respect to the wickedness of removing landmarks, (יַסִּיגוּ=יַשִּׂיגוּ, from סוג) comp. Deut. xix. 14; xxvii. 17; Prov. xxii. 28; xxiii. 10. In regard to the plundering and carrying off of herds, comp. ch. xx. 19. ["They steal flocks, וַיִּרְעוּ *i. e.*, they are so bare-faced, that after they have stolen them, they pasture them openly." Delitzsch].

Ver. 3. נָהַג, "to drive away," as in Is. xx. 4; חָבַל, "to distrain, to take as a pledge" as in Ex. xxii. 25; Deut. xxiv. 6; comp. below ver. 9 (whereas on the other hand in ch. xxii. 6 the word is used in a somewhat different sense). [The ass of the orphan, and the yoke-ox of the widow are here referred to as the most valuable possession, and principal dependence of those unfortunate ones.—E.].

Ver. 4. **The poor they thrust out of the way**—*i. e.*, out of the way, in which they have the right to walk, into roadless regions (comp. הִטָּה in a similar sense in Amos v. 12). **All together** (יַחַד as in ch. iii. 18) **the wretched of the land must hide themselves.**—So according to the K'ri: עֲנִיֵּי־אָרֶץ, while the K'thibh עַנְוֵי־א׳ would, according to Ps. lxxvi. 10; Zeph. ii. 3 designate the "afflicted," the "sufferers" of the land, which seems less suitable here. The Pass. חֻבְּאוּ denotes what these unfortunate ones are compelled to do; comp. ch. xxx. 7.

Sixth Strophe; vers. 5-8. Description of the miserable condition into which the oppressed and persecuted are brought by those wicked ones (not of another class of evil-doers apart from those previously spoken of, as ancient exegesis for the most part assumed, and as latterly Rosenm., Umbr., Vaih. [Lee, Barnes, Carey, Scott, *etc.*] explain). As is evident from the more extended description in ch. xxx. 1-8 of the unsettled, vagabond life of such unfortunates, the poet has here before his eyes the aborigines of the lands east of the Jordan, who were driven from their homes into the desert, possibly the remnant of the ancient Horites [cave-dwellers]; comp. what is said more in detail below on ch. xxx. **Behold, wild asses in the wilderness** (*i. e. as* wild asses; comp. ch. vi. 5; xi. 12; xxxix. 5 seq.), **they go forth in their daily work** (lit. "work;" comp. Ps. civ. 23), **seeking after prey** (טֶרֶף, booty, prey, a living, as in Prov. xxxi. 15) ["from טָרַף in the primary signification *decerpere* describes that which in general forms their daily occupation as they roam about. . . . The idea of waylaying is not to be connected with the expression." Del.]; **the steppe** [עֲרָבָה, the wide, open, desert plain] **is to them** (lit. "to *him*," *viz.*, to each one of them), [or "to him as father of the company," Del., or possibly the sing. לוֹ is used to avoid the concurrence of לָהֶם with לֶחֶם immediately following: Hirzel] **bread for their children**—(נְעָרִים as in ch. i. 19; xxix. 5) ["the steppe, with its scant supply of roots and herbs, is to him food for the children; he snatches it from it, it must furnish it to him" (Del.) thus accounting for the use of טֶרֶף]. A striking description of the beggar, vagabond life of these troglodytes, the precursors of the gipsies, or South-African Bushmen of to-day. [Of the פְּרָאִים, *onagri* (Kulans), with which these are compared, Delitzsch says: "Those beautiful animals, which, while young, are difficult to be caught; which in their love of freedom are an image of the Beduin, Gen. xvi. 12; in their untractableness an image of that which cannot be bound, ch. xi. 12; and from their roaming about in herds in waste regions, are here an image of a gregarious vagrant, and freebooter kind of life." Del.]

Ver. 6. **In the field they reap** (so according to the K'ri יִקְצוֹרוּ; the K'thibh יַקְצִירוּ would be rendered by some such expression as "they make for a harvest") **the cattle-fodder** [בְּלִילוֹ, as in ch. vi. 5, mixed fodder for the cattle, *farrago*]; lit. "*his* cattle-fodder, *i. e.* that of the רָשָׁע mentioned in *b*. [Most explain this to mean that these miserable hirelings seek to satisfy their hunger with the fodder grown for the cattle. Delitzsch on the ground that "קָצַר does not signify to sweep together, but to reap in an orderly manner; and if they meant to steal why did they not seize the better portion of the produce?" supposes that the "rich evil-doer hires them to cut the fodder for his cattle, but does not like to entrust the reaping of the better kinds of corn to them." This view, however, seems less natural than the former, and less in harmony with the parallelism. See below on *b*.—E.]. **And they glean the vineyard of the wicked.** לקשׁ *serotinos fructus colligere* (Rosenm.), to glean the late-ripe fruit, *i. e.* stealing it. The meaning can scarcely be that this was done in the service of the rich evil-doer, in which case the verb עוֹלֵל *racemari* would rather have been used (against Delitzsch).

Ver. 7. **Naked** (עָרוֹם, adverbial accusative, as in ver. 10; comp. שׁוֹלָל, ch. xii. 17, 19) **they pass the night without clothing,** מִבְּלִי lit. "from the lack of," comp. ver. 8 *b*. and ver. 10.

Ver. 8. . . . **And shelterless** (from lack of shelter) **they clasp the rock.**—חִבְּקוּ, they "embrace" the rock, in that shivering they crouch beneath it as their shelter. Comp. the phrase, "embracing the dunghill" (*mezabil*), Lam. iv. 5.

Seventh Strophe: vers. 9-12. Resuming the description of the tyrannical conduct of those men of power described in vers. 2-4. **They tear the orphan from the breast.**—שֹׁד here the same as שַׁד, as also in Is. lx. 16; lxvi. 11. Correctly therefore the LXX.: ἀπὸ μαστοῦ—whereas to render שֹׁד in its customary signification of "destruction, ruin" (as *e. g.* by Ramban, *etc.*) [="from the shattered patrimony"], yields no satisfactory meaning. The act of tearing away from the breast is conceived of as the violent deed of harsh creditors, who would satisfy their claims by bringing up the orphan children as slaves. **And what the miserable one has on they take away as a pledge.**—A tenable meaning, and one that will agree well with ver. 10 is obtained only by regarding וְעַל as an elliptical expression for וַאֲשֶׁר עַל: "and what is on the miserable one," *i. e.* what he wears, his clothing (Ralbag, Gesen., Arnh., Vaih., Dillmann) [Rod., Bernard, Noyes]. With the thought may then be compared Mic. ii. 9; in respect to חבל see above on ver. 3. The other explanations which have been given are less suited to the connection, if not absolutely impossible, such as: "they take a pledge above [beyond the ability of] the sufferer" (Hirzel); "they take for a pledge the *suckling* (וְעֻל) of the poor") (Kamphausen) [Elzas]; "with the poor they deal basely," or "knavishly" (Umbr., Del.), which latter rendering however would make it seem strange that the verb חבל has only a short while before been used twice (ver. 3, and ch. xxii. 6) in the sense of distraining. [To which add Dillmann's objection that this interpretation seems "colorless," out of place in the series of graphic, concrete touches of which the description is composed. It may also be said of the explanation of E. V. Ewald, Schlott., Renan, Conant, *etc.*, "they impose a pledge on the sufferers," that it is less vivid than that adopted above. It must be admitted on the other hand that the assumption that עַל= אשר על is somewhat doubtful.—E.].

Vers. 10-12 again bring into the foreground as subject those who are maltreated by the proud oppressors. These are however no longer represented as the wretched inhabitants of steppes or caves, but as poor serfs on the estates of the rich, and are thus represented as being in inhabited cities and their vicinity. **Naked they** (the poor) **slink about, without clothing.**—Comp. ver. 7, and in respect to הִלֵּךְ, "to slink," see ch. xxx. 28. **And hungry they bear the sheaves**—*i. e.* for the rich, whose hired service they perform, who however allow them to go hungry in their service, and thus become guilty of the crying sin of the *merces retenta laborum* (Deut. xxv. 4; 1 Tim. v. 18, *etc.*). [The English translators, misled probably by the Piel, הִלְּכוּ, which they took to be transitive, have made the "oppressors" of the vers. preceding the subject of ver. 10. הִלֵּךְ however is always "to walk about, to go to and fro" (so also in Prov. viii. 20). Taking it in this sense here, the subject is naturally "the poor;" and נשׂא in the second member is simply "to bear, not "to take away from."—E.]

Ver. 11. **Between their walls** (hence under their strict supervision) **they must press out the oil** (יַצְהִירוּ, Hiph. denom., only here); **they tread the wine-vats, and suffer thirst** (while so engaged—Imperf. consec. comp. Ewald, § 342, *a*). A further violation of the law that the mouth of the ox must not be muzzled.

Ver. 12. **Out of the cities the dying groan.**—So according to the reading מֵתִים (Pesh., 1 Ms. of de Rossi's, and some of the older editions), which word indeed elsewhere means "the dead," but which here, as the parallel of the following חֲלָלִים ("wounded, pierced to death," comp. Ezek. xxvi. 15: Jer. li. 22) may very well be taken to mean the dying, those who utter the groaning and rattling of the death struggle [see Green, § 266, 2, *a*]. So correctly Umbreit, Ew., Hirz., Vaih., Stick., Heiligst., Dillmann [Schlott., Renan, Noyes. Others (Carey, Elzas, *etc.*) in the weaker sense: "mortals."] The usual reading מְתִים, "men," yields a suitable rendering only by disregarding the masoretic accentuation, and connecting this מְתִים as subj. with יִנְאָקוּ (so Jer., Symmachus, Theod.). In that case, however, it should be translated not by the colorless and indefinite term "people" [*Leute*] (Hahn, *etc.*) but by "men [Männen, *viri*], warriors," and understood (with Del.) of the male population of a city, "whom a conqueror would put to the sword." This however would remove the discourse too far out of the circle of thought in which it has hitherto removed. [According to the Masor. punctuations מֵעִיר מְתִים would be "out of an inhabited, thickly populated city," a thought which has no place in the connection. Gesenius, followed by Conant, takes עִיר (II Lex.) in the sense of "anguish:" "for anguish do the dying groan." But the second member: "**and the soul of the wounded cries out,**" brings up before us a scene of blood, involving the slaying of a *multitude*, for which we should have been unprepared without the mention of the "city" in the first member.—E.]. **Yet God regards not the folly!**—תִּפְלָה, lit. ["insipidity], absurdity, *insulsitas* (chap. i. 22), a contemptuous expression which seems very suitable here, serving as it does to describe tersely the violence of the wicked, mocking at the moral order of the universe, and still remaining unpunished. The punctuation תְּפִלָּה, "prayer, supplication" (Pesh., some MSS.) [Con., Noyes, Good, Elzas], may also be properly passed by without consideration. In regard to the absolute use of לֹא־יָשִׂים (supply בְּלִבּוֹ, comp. ch. xxii. 22), "he regards not," see ch. iv. 20; Is. xli. 20; and especially Ps. l. 23, where, precisely as here, the expression is construed with the accus. of the object. [The rendering of E. V.: "yet God layeth (=imputeth) not folly to them," is not essentially different, but is less

expressive. Oppression ravages the earth; in the wilderness, among rocks and caves, in fields and vineyards, in villages and cities, men suffer, groan, die—and all this chaotic folly, this dark anomaly, this mockery of the Divine order—God heeds it not!—E.]

4. *Second Division: Second Half:* vers. 13-25. Continuation of the preceding description, in which special prominence is given to those evil-doers who commit their crimes *in secret*, and escape for a long time the divine punishment, which surely awaits them.

Eighth Strophe: vers. 13-17. **Those** (הֵמָּה, emphatically contrasting the present objects of the description, as a new class of evil-doers, with those previously mentioned) **are rebels against the light**, or: "are become rebels," *etc.;* for so may the clause הָיוּ בְּ with בּ *essential*, comp. ch. xxiii. 13) be taken, unless we prefer to explain: "are become *among* apostates from the light," *i. e.* have acquired the nature of such (Del., Dillm.) [in either case היה is not the mere copula, but expresses a process of *becoming*]. מֹרְדֵי־אוֹר, "apostates, revolters from the light, enemies of the light," are essentially the same, as "children of the night" (Rom. xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 5; Eph. v. 8, *etc.*—**Will not know its ways**; *i. e.* the ways of the light, for it is more natural to refer the suffix in דְּרָכָיו, as well as in נְתִיבוֹתָיו to אוֹר than to "God."

Ver. 14. **At the dawn** (לָאוֹר, *sub lucem, cum diluculo*, toward the break of day, before it is yet broad daylight) **the murderer riseth up.** רוֹצֵחַ, one who makes a trade of murder, who kills to steal, like the English garotter; for the wealthy oppressor is no longer (down to ver. 18) the subject of the discourse.—[**He slays the poor and needy**: because of their defenceless condition; not of course for plunder, but to gratify his bloodthirsty disposition.]—**And in the night he acts like a thief**, or: "he becomes as the thief," *i. e.* in the depths of night, when there is no one to cross his path, he plies the trade of a petty, common thief, committing burglary, *etc.* For the Jussive יְהִי instead of יִהְיֶה, comp. above ch. xviii. 12; xx. 23, *etc.* [poetic form]; and for אֶחָז, instead of אֲחִזֶה, ch. xxiii. 9.

Ver. 15. **And the adulterer's eye watches** (שָׁמַר, *observare*, to be on the watch for, to lurk for) **the twilight**, *i. e.* the evening twilight, before the approach of which he does not ply his craft; comp. Prov. vii. 9. נֶשֶׁף here *crepusculum;* see above on chap. iii. 9.—**And puts a veil over the face**: lit. "and lays on a covering of the face," *i. e.*, some kind of a veil;—hardly a mask, of which oriental antiquity had no knowledge: comp. Delitzsch on the passage.

Ver. 16. **They break in the dark into houses**; lit. "he," or "one breaks in;" the indefinite subj. of חתר. is, as the plurals in the following members show, an entire band of thieves.—**They, who by day keep themselves shut up, know not the light**, *i. e.* they have no fellowship with it, as children of night and of darkness. The rendering of the Targ. and of some of the Rabbis (approximately also of the Vulg.) [also of E. V.]: "which (houses) they had *marked* for themselves in the daytime," is opposed by the fact that חתם signifies always *obsignare*, never *designare;* comp. ch. xiv. 17; xxxvii. 7.

Ver. 17. **For to them all deep darkness is morning**; *i. e.* when the deepest darkness of the night (צלמות, comp. ch. iii. 5) begins, then they enter upon their day's work [the drawing on of the night is to them what day-break is to others]—a striking characteristic of the ἔργα τοῦ σκότους, in which these evil-doers engage. Umbreit and Hirzel [and so E. V. Ber., Con.] unsuitably take not צלמות, but בֹּקֶר as subject: "the morning is to them at once deep darkness." Against this explanation it may be urged that יַחְדָּו means not "at once," but as in ch. ii. 11; ix. 32, *etc.*, "all together, all in a body."—**Because they know the terrors of deep darkness**; *i. e.* are familiar with them, as other men are with the open day; comp. ver. 16 *c;* ch. xxxviii. 16. The sing. again makes its appearance here [כִּי יַכִּיר, lit. "for he (or one) knows," *etc.*], because stress is laid on the fact that every member of this wicked band has this familiarity with the darkness of night. [According to the rendering of E. V., Hirzel, *etc.*, here rejected, the meaning would be that morning or daylight would bring terror to these evil-doers, the fear *i. e.* of being detected and condemned. In the second member כִּי יַכִּיר would then be antecedent, either general: "when one can discern" (Con.), or particular: "if one know them" (E. V.) and בַּלְהוֹת צַלְמָוֶת, the consequent—"terrors of death-shade!" The other rendering, however, has on the whole the advantage of greater simplicity, and agreement with usage and the context.—E.]

Ninth Strophe: vers. 18-21. The judgment which will overtake the wicked who have been thus far described. This judgment Job describes here proleptically, for in vers. 22-24 *a* he returns once again to their haughty, insolent conduct *before* the judgment comes, in order to bring out the thought that a long time usually elapses before it overtakes them. This strophe sets forth, in the first place, and this intentionally in strong language, which in the mouth of Job is quite surprising, that a grievous punishment and certain destruction infallibly awaits them; but that such destruction, for the most part, is long delayed, is maintained in the following strophe, which, however, in ver. 24 again resumes the description of the destruction. The language does not permit us with the LXX., Vulg., Pesh., Eichh., Dathe, Umbr., Vaih, *etc.*, to take these verses in an optative sense, as a description of the punishment, which *ought* to befal evil-doers: thus at the outset in ver. 18 we have קַל הוּא, not יְהִי קַל הוּא; and so throughout every sign of the optative form of speech is wanting. It is possible, but the same is not indicated with sufficient clearness by the author,

and for that reason is altogether too artificial, to take vers 18–21 (with Ewald, Hirzel, Schlottm., v. Gerlach, Heiligstedt, Dillmann) as a description of the well-merited judgment inflicted on the wicked, ironically attributed by Job to his opponents, Job's own opinion on the opposite side being in that case annexed to it in ver. 22 seq. See against this opinion, as well as against the related opinion of Stickel, Böttcher, Hahn, *etc.*, the remarks of Delitzsch [ii. 33: "(1) There is not the slightest trace observable in vers. 18–21 that Job does not express his own view. (2) There is no such decided contrast between vers. 18–21 and vers. 22-25, for ver. 19 and ver. 24 both affirm substantially the same thing concerning the end of the evil doer. In like manner it is not to be supposed with Stickel, Löw., Böttch , Welte and Hahn, that Job, outstripping the friends, as far as ver. 21, describes how the evil-doer certainly often comes to a terrible end, and in ver. 22 seq., how the very opposite of this, however, is often witnessed; so that this consequently furnishes no evidence in support of the exclusive assertion of the friends. Moreover, ver. 24 compared with ver. 19, where there is nothing to indicate a direct contrast, is opposed to it; and ver. 22, which has no appearance of referring to a direct contrast with what has been previously said, is opposed to such an antithetical rendering of the two final strophes."]

Ver. 18. **His course is swift on the face of the waters**: *i. e.* lightly and swiftly is he born hence, as one who is swept away irresistibly by the flood; comp. ch. ix. 26; Hos. x. 7. [Carey curiously conjectures that this ver. speaks of pirates!]—**Accursed is their portion in the land**; or: "a curse befals," *etc.* (Dillm.). [In German: Im Fluge ist er dahin auf Wassers Fläche; verflucht wird ihr Grundstück im Lande; or according to Dillmann: Flucht trifft, *etc.*, whereby, continues Zöckler, the paronomasia between תְּקֻלַּל and קַל is still more clearly expressed. This paronomasia it is impossible to reproduce in English without slightly paraphrasing the one term or the other. The above attempts to combine the verbal play with fidelity to the German original: "his course is swift" for "im Fluge dahin," and "accursed" for "verflucht."] Whether a divine curse, or a curse on the part of men, is intended, seems doubtful: still parallel passages, such as ch. v. 3; xviii. 20, favor the latter view. The interchange of plur. and sing. occurs here as in ver. 16.—**He enters no more on the way of the vineyard**; lit. "he *turns* no more into the way to the vineyard" (comp. 1 Sam. xiii. 18); *i. e.* there is an end of his frequent resorting to his favorite possession, and in general of his enjoyment of the same. Observe that from here on *wealthy* evil-doers again form the prominent subject of the description; in this differing from vers. 13-17.

Ver. 19. **Drought and heat carry off** [יִגְזְלוּ lit. "bear away as plunder"] **the snow-water** (comp. ch. vi. 16 seq.): **so the underworld those who have sinned.**—חָטָאוּ, a relative clause, which is at the same time the object of the verb in the first member, which extends its influence also to the second member. As to the sentiment, comp. Ps. xlix. 13 [12] 21 [20]; also ver. 18 *a;* not however ch. xxi. 23. where rather the euthanasia [of the subject] is described, not his sudden end without deliverance.

Ver. 20. **The womb forgets him,** (whereas) **the worms feed sweetly on him.**—The two short sentences which constitute this member stand in blunt contrast to each other. מתק here *sensu activo:* to taste anything with pleasure, *delectari aliqua re* (lit. "to suck"—hence the meaning "sweet"). **So then is iniquity broken like the tree**—(*i. e.* like a shattered, or felled tree; comp. Eccles. xi. 3; Dan. iv. 7 seq.; also above ch. xix. 10). Instead of the wicked man his injurious conduct (עַוְלָה, comp. on ch. v. 16) is here mentioned as having come to an end, while ver. 21 again speaks in the concrete concerning the evil-doer himself, in order to point to his heinous bloodguiltiness as the cause of his punishment. ["The fundamental thought of the strophe is this, that neither in life nor in death had he suffered the punishment of his evil-doing. The figure of the broken tree (broken in its full vigor) also corresponds to this thought; comp. on the other hand what Bildad says, ch. xviii. 16: "his roots dry up beneath, and above his branch is lopped off" (or: withered). The severity of his oppression is not manifest till after his death." Delitzsch].

Ver. 21. **He who hath plundered** (lit. "fed upon, devoured," comp. ch. xx. 26) **the barren, that beareth not** (who has therefore no children to protect her), **and hath done no good to the widow**—but on the contrary has shown himself hard of heart towards her. On the form יֵיטִיב comp. Gesen. § 70 [§ 69], 2, Rem. [Green, § 150, 2] [The Participial form רֹעֶה introducing the characteristics of the c'ass, and followed by finite verb according to Gesen. § 131, Rem. 2].

Tenth Strophe: vers. 22-25. **And yet He preserveth long the men of might by His strength**—*i. e.*, but truly (וְ before משך is at once adversative and restrictive). He (God, comp. ver. 23) often greatly prolongs the life of such mighty evil-doers (אַבִּירִים, comp. Is. xlvi. 12) ["the strong, who bid defiance not only to every danger, (Ps. lxxvi. 6) but also to all divine influences and noble impulses." Delitzsch]. On משך as applied to the agency of God in prolonging life comp. Is. xiii. 22; Ps. xxxvi. 11; lxxxv. 6 [5]. **Such an one rises up again, although despairing of life**—when he had already despaired of continuing in life. [So far from using his power to crush the mighty villains of earth, God uses it to bring them triumphantly through those crises in which they themselves had given up all hope —E.] וְלֹא־יַאֲמִין subordinate circumstantial clause, comp. Ewald, § 341, *a.*—חַיִּין, Aramaizing plur. like מִלִּין, ch. iv. 2. [According to E. V. and most commentators the subject of ver. 22 is still the wicked man, משך being taken to mean: "to draw, drag" as a captive; or "to hold, bind;"

or "to destroy. 'He subjugates the mighty, and puts all in terror for their very life.' The interpretation given above however is more in accord with the proper meaning of מָשַׁךְ, with ver. 23 understood as having God for its subject; and is specially favored by the consideration that it gives more distinct expression to the thought, so important to Job's argument here of the *lengthening out* of the life and prosperity of the evil-doer, and of the long delay of his punishment. The omission of the Divine Name is so characteristic of our book as to present no difficulty.—E.].

Ver. 23. **He grants him safety** (lit. "He (God) grants to him to be in safety; permits him to be at his ease [לָבֶטַח, adverbial, of the state or condition He grants him to be in]; **so that he is sustained** (וְיִשָּׁעֵן, expressing the consequence of that divine grant of security), **and His** (God's) **eyes are upon their ways**—in order, namely, to keep them therein, and to bless and protect them; comp. הוֹפִיעַ עַל, ch. x. 3. [God's eyes, says Job, follow the prosperous evil-doer with watchful interest, to see that he does not step out of the path of security and success! According to the other interpretation, which continues the evil-doer as the subject, the meaning is that the oppressor allows to those who are in his power only a transient respite, watching for every pretence or opportunity to injure them. See Scott. The full-toned suffix ־ֵיהוּ seems chosen for emphasis.—E.].

Ver. 24. **They rise high—a little while only, and they are gone.** רֹמּוּ, 3 Plur. Perf. from רוּם=רמם, to raise oneself, to mount upward" (Ew. § 114 *a;* comp. Gesen. § 67 [§ 66] Rem. 1 [Green, § 139, 1], מְעַט with following וְ for the consequent, forms a short sentence by itself, as in Ps. xxxvii. 10. As to וְאֵינֶנּוּ "then he is no more," comp. Gen. v. 24. The interchange of numbers as in ver. 16 and ver. 18. **And they are bowed down** (concerning הֻמְּכוּ [Aramaizing] Hoph. from מכך, comp. Gesen. § 67 [§ 66], Rem. 1); **like all they perish** (*i. e.* like all others), **and as the top of the ears** [of grain: *i. e.* the grain-bearing head of the wheat-stalk] **they wither.**—יִקָּמְצוּן, lit. "they shrivel together" (Niph. Reflex. from Kal; comp. ch. v. 16) *i. e.*, they perish. There is no reference to the *componere artus* of the dead [Ges. "to gather oneself up, composing the body and limbs as in death," which here would mean to die in the course of nature, not by violence, or suddenly], nor to the "housing," *i. e.* the burial of the dead (comp. Ezek. xxix. 5). The expression is rather a figure taken from vegetable life, like the following יִמָּלוּ, "they wither like the heads of grain;" see on ch. xlii. 2. [It may be claimed with reason that the connection here favors the definition, "to be cut off," the oriental custom of reaping being to cut off the tops, leaving long stalks standing in the field.] It is not altogether in the sense of euthanasia, therefore, of an easy, painless death, as described in ch. xxi. 23, that the present passage is to be understood (against Ewald, Dillmann, *etc.*, also Del.). It rather resumes the description in ver 18 seq , although in less forcible language, and in such a way as to set forth a natural death, such as all die, rather than that caused by a divine judgment, such as often falls upon the wicked.

Ver. 25. And should it not be so (וְאִם־לֹא אֵפוֹ as in ch. ix. 24) **who will convict me of falsehood, and make my speech of no effect?**—The phrase שִׂים לְאַל (instead of which Symm., Vulg., Pesh. read (שׂ׳ לְאַל) is precisely the same with *εἰς μηδὲν τιθέναι.* or our: "bring to nought," comp. Ewald, § 286, *g;* 321, *b.* The whole question is a triumphant expression of the superiority which Job vividly felt himself to possess over his opponents, especially in the views derived from experience which he had just urged respecting the incomprehensible dealings of God with the destinies of men.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The significance of the present discourse of Job lies essentially in its *descriptive* treatment of ethical and anthropological themes, some passages even describing matters of interest in the history of civilization (ch. xxiv. 5 seq.), whereas the speculative and theological element becomes subordinate. The latter is restricted almost exclusively to the first and shorter Division, which is occupied with the mystery of Job's own destiny of suffering, just as the second Division is occupied with the obverse side of this mystery, the prosperity and impunity of the wicked. That which the first Division says touching the inexplicableness of his sufferings is substantially only a repetition of the wish, already several times uttered, that God by His personal intervention might decide the controversy, and confirm his innocence, combined with a statement of the reasons why this wish could not be realized. On the first of these reasons, to wit: that on account of the overwhelming majesty pertaining to the appearance of God, the Unapproachable and Almighty One, it would be impossible for him to put in his answer before Him (ch. xxiii. 6) he does not dwell this time as on two former occasions (ch. ix. 34; xiii. 21); he merely touches it with suggestive brevity. His consciousness of innocence is too strong to allow him to give way long to this thought; thanks to the incessant assaults and accusations of the friends, it has become consolidated and strengthened to such a degree that in ch. xix. (as indeed had been the case before here and there, especially in ch. xvi. 17; xvii. 9) it even found utterance in decided exaggeration, and drove him to extreme assertions touching his absolute blamelessness and immaculateness, for which he must hereafter implore pardon. Among these assertions we find the following: that he would come forth out of God's trial of him like gold, that he would never swerve from His ways, that he had always observed the words of His mouth more than his own law (ch. xxiii. 10-12). All the more emphatic however is the stress which he lays on the other reasons why that wish seems to him incapable of realization. God, he thinks, purposely withdraws Himself from him. It is deliberately and with good reason that He keeps Himself at a distance and hidden from him, it being now His settled purpose to make

him drain his cup of suffering to the dregs (ch. xxiii. 13 seq.). ["Job's suspicion against God is as dreadful as it is childish. This is a profoundly tragic stroke. It is not to be understood as the sarcasm of defiance; on the contrary, as one of the childish thoughts into which melancholy bordering on madness falls. From the bright height of faith to which Job soars in ch. xix. 25 seq., he is here again drawn down into the most terrible depth of conflict, in which, like a blind man, he gropes after God, and because he cannot find Him thinks that He flees before him lest He should be overcome by him. The God of the present Job accounts his enemy; and the God of the future to whom his faith clings, who will and must vindicate him so soon as He only allows Himself to be found and seen—this God is not to be found." Delitzsch.]. It is not the invisible essence of God in general, not that He cannot be discovered by those who seek Him on earth east or west, north or south (vers. 8-9)—it is not the pure spirituality and the divine omnipresence, which extinguishes his hope in God's interposition to vindicate and to redeem him. The thought of that divine unsearchableness, which he beautifully describes in a way that reminds us of Ps. cxxxix. 7-9, as well as of Zophar's first discourse (ch. xi. 8-9), could have had nothing terrible or cheerless for him. Just as little (as he expressly declares in the closing verse of the First Part, ch. xxiii. 17) would the contemplation of his woful physical condition, and the tragical calamities of his outward life have sufficed to plunge him into the fear of death and dumb despair. That which fills him with dismay and terror, that which makes his heart faint, and removes the prospect of his deliverance to the indefinite future, is that same *predestinatianism*, that same dread of a mysterious, inexorable, and as regards himself malign decree of God, which had already extorted repeatedly from him a cry of lamentation, and which had formed the dark back-ground which so often emerges behind his meditations thus far (comp. ch. vi. 9 seq.; vii. 12 seq.; ix. 22 sqq.; x. 13 seq.; xiii. 15 seq.; xvi. 12 sq.; xix. 6 seq.). No comforting, brightening, alleviating thought, no joyous soaring of hope in God's compassion, bringing help however late, is to be seen anywhere in this discourse, as was the case *e. g.* in ch. xvii. and xix. On the contrary the Second Division of the discourse lays out before us a much wider circle of phenomena and sentiments at variance with a righteous and merciful activity on the part of God. The experience which he had, or believed that he had, of God's treatment of him as unsympathetic and harsh, as being a mere exhibition of divine power, without the slightest trace of justice or fatherly kindness—this experience he utters in the general proposition: "that God had appointed no times of judgment, would let His friends see no days on this earth in which He would exercise righteous retribution" (ch. xxiv. 1). This proposition he expands into an eloquent description of the manifold injustice, which men of the most diverse classes inflict on one another, while the wrongs of the outraged and oppressed weaker party are never redressed or avenged (ch. xxiv. 2 seq). Toward the end of this picture, which is true in a sense, although one-sided in its tendency, he changes his tone somewhat to be sure, and by strongly emphasizing the certainty that a rigid judgment of God will at the last terminate the course of the wicked (vers. 18-21, 24), qualifies the preceding accusation against the divine justice. Even this however is by no means a surrender to the doctrine of a retribution in this life, as taught by the friends. The chief emphasis even in this passage rests rather on the *long delay* (משך ver. 22 *a*) in interposing for such punishment, on the long duration of their impunity from punishment, or even on the not uncommon prolongation of this state down to their natural death, to which they are subject in common with all men (ver. 24; see on the ver.). Job here certainly concedes something to his opponents, essentially however not much more than he had conceded already in ch. xxi. where (ver. 17 seq.; 23 seq.) without denying the fact of the final punishment of the ungodly, he had represented it as much more commonly the case that they were spared any judicial inflictions down to the end of their life. The triumphant exclamation with which he ends his speech: "who will convict me of falsehood?" is intended simply to confirm this fact of experience, in accordance with which this *impunitas hominum sceleratorum* is the general rule, whereas their *justa punitio* is the exception, at least in this world.

2. Job however does concede *somewhat* more here than there; he at least *dwells* longer on the punishment of the ungodly, as a fact which is not altogether unheard of in the course of human destiny—whether the passage in which he describes it be only a free quotation of the language of his opponents, as the later commentators in part exclaim (see on ver. 18 seq.), of the expression of his own conviction. And this indicates clearly enough progress for the better in his temper of mind and mode of thought, a progress which is still further indicated by the fact that in the preceding description of God as restraining Himself in the infliction of punishment a calm tone of objective description has a decided predominance, and nothing more is to be discerned of his former passionate, at times even blasphemous complaints touching the tyrannical harshness and cruel vindictiveness of the Almighty in persecuting him with poisoned arrows, sword-thrusts, and merciless scourgings. The terrible fatalistic phantom of a God exercising only His power, and not also His justice and love, which had formerly tortured him, has unmistakably assumed a milder form, of a less threatening aspect than heretofore. In consequence of this, as well as by virtue of the calm dignity which enables him to meet with complete serenity the violent assaults and detractions of Eliphaz, and to avoid all controversy of a bttter personal character, his superiority over his opponents becomes ever more apparent, his statements and arguments drive with ever greater directness at the only possible solution of the controversy, and even where he is one-sided, as particularly in his description, in many respects impressive, of the course of the wicked, and of the needy ones whom they persecute (ch. xxiv. 2-17), his discussion has great value, and a fascinating power which is all the stronger by

virtue of the comparatively calm objective tone of the treatment. It is in these indications of the growing purity and clearness of the sufferer's spiritual frame, that the practical and homiletic lessons of the present section can be most advantageously studied.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ch. xxiii. ver. 3 seq.—Oecolampadius (on ver. 7): This word "disputing" or "reproving" expresses confidence rather than impatience or an unfavorable estimate of God. But if we blame this in Job, we must also blame what John and others say; "if our hearts condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God." And wherefore does Christ command us to lift up our heads at His coming? Zeyss: Faith and a good conscience are the two chief jewels of a Christian (1 Tim. i. 5). Happy he who has kept these. When oppressed he can appear with confidence before God.

Ver. 8 seq. Brentius: Although God fills all things, and is all in all, we cannot approach Him, nor find Him *without a Mediator;* whether we seek Him before or behind, to the right hand or to the left, He is always afar off, we never lay hold upon Him. For even if we should attempt to approach Him without a mediator, we are deterred from having access to Him in part by the darkness in which He dwells, in part by His power and majesty, in part by His justice.

Ver. 13 seq. Zeyss: As God is one in His nature, so also is He unchangeable in His will (Num. xxiii. 19; 1 Sam. xv. 29). Let us therefore submit ourselves in humility and obedience to His good and holy will! The cross which He lays upon us is always less than our sins deserve; His chastisements are tempered with mercy; Ps. ciii. 10.—v. Gerlach (on ver. 17): In the consciousness of the treatment which he receives from the incomprehensible God, who has irrevocably determined every man's destiny, Job is penetrated by the profoundest terror before this God. It is not his calamity in itself, not even his own experience of the extremity to which this calamity has brought him from which he shrinks. What a deep glance is here given us into the heart of a sorely tried servant of God, who in his complaints and struggles, spite of all suffering, thinks only of God, and fears nothing so much as that the fellowship of his God having been withdrawn from him, his God should become a terror to him.

Ch. xxiv. 2 seq. Wohlfarth: How should the contemplation of the unnumbered sins, with which God's fair earth is stained, affect us? Job was led thereby into temptation to doubt God's justice. Let it not be so with us, who, enlightened by Christ, should see therein rather: (*a*) a melancholy proof of the continual inclination of our nature to evil, and of the slothfulness of our spirit to strive against the same; (*b*) a touching evidence of the long-suffering and patience of God; (*c*) an earnest warning to be on our guard against every temptation; (*d*) an emphatic reminder of the day of judgment, which will recompense every man according to his works.

Ver. 17. Starke: As works of the light are accompanied by a joyful conscience and good courage, so on the other hand with works of darkness there is nothing but fear, anguish and terror. For even the abandoned are not without an inward punishment in the conscience.—V. Gerlach: For sinners, who shun the light, the light of day itself is darkness, since through their departure from the eternal light of God, they bear about with them night in their souls (comp. Matt. vi. 23; John xi. 10), and thus they feel its terrors even in the midst of the brightness of the day.

Ver. 23 seq. Starke: Be not secure, if a sin passes unpunished; it is not on that account forgotten by God. The happier the ungodly are for a time, the more dangerous is their condition, and the more severely will they be punished at last.

II. Bildad and Job: Chap. XXV—XXVI.

A.—Bildad: Again setting forth the contrast between God's exaltation and human impotence.

Chapter XXV.

1. Man cannot argue with God.

Verses 2–4.

1 Then answered Bildad the Shuhite, and said:

2 Dominion and fear are with Him,
He maketh peace in His high places.

3 Is there any number of His armies?
and upon whom doth not His light arise?

4 How then can man be justified with God?
or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?

2. Man is not pure before God: vers. 5, 6.

5 Behold even to the moon, and it shineth not;
yea, the stars are not pure in His sight.
6 How much less man, that is a worm;
and the son of man, which is a worm?

B.—Job: Rebuke of his opponent, accompanied by a description, far surpassing his, of the exaltation and greatness of God.

CHAPTER XXVI.

1. Sharp rebuff of Bildad: vers. 1–4.

1 But Job answered, and said:

2 How hast thou helped him that is without power?
how savest thou the arm that hath no strength?
3 How hast thou counselled him that hath no wisdom?
and how hast thou plentifully declared the thing as it is?
4 To whom hast thou uttered words?
and whose spirit came from thee?

2. Description of the incomparable sovereignty and exaltation of God, given to surpass the far less spirited effort of Bildad in this direction: vers. 5-14.

5 Dead things are formed
from under the waters, and the inhabitants thereof.
6 Hell is naked before Him,
and destruction hath no covering.
7 He stretcheth out the north over the empty place,
and hangeth the earth upon nothing.

8 He bindeth up the waters in His thick clouds;
and the cloud is not rent under them.
9 He holdeth back the face of His throne,
and spreadeth His cloud upon it.
10 He hath compassed the waters with bounds,
until the day and night come to an end.

11 The pillars of heaven tremble,
and are astonished at His reproof.
12 He divideth the sea with His power,
and by His understanding He smiteth through the proud.
13 By His spirit He hath garnished the heavens;
His hand hath formed the crooked serpent.

14 Lo, these are parts of His ways:
but how little a portion is heard of Him?
but the thunder of His power who can understand?

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Job's reply to the last assaults of Eliphaz had certainly avoided all personality, but had at the same time asserted his complete innocence in very strong, almost objectionable language (ch. xxiii. 10-12). It is more particularly to this vulnerable point that Bildad turns his attention in this, his last discourse, which limits itself to showing how unbecoming it is for man—this miserable worm of the earth—to arrogate to himself any right whatever before God, or to impute to himself any justice. In substance, accordingly, he lays down only two propositions, and that without enlarging on them, to wit: (1) Man cannot argue with God, the Almighty; (2) Before God, the Holy One, man cannot be pure. In this discourse, which closes the series of attacks on Job, he describes the divine greatness and exaltation, a description which is decidedly meagre, made up only of repetitions of what Eliphaz had said in his former discourses (comp. ch. iv. 17 seq.; xv. 14 seq.). No wonder that Job discovers the opportunity thus presented to him, and in his reply, first of all, addresses to

the speaker a sharp, bitterly satirical rebuff, and then meets his propositions in regard to God's greatness and holiness, not by denying them, but by surpassing them with a far more magnificent and eloquent description of the same divine attributes. [And note particularly that as Bildad's illustrations of his theme are drawn from the heavenly hosts and luminaries, Job in his reply dwells principally, though not exclusively on God's greatness as manifested in the heavens above.—E.]—The Strophe-scheme of both discourses is very simple, Bildad's discourse containing only two strophes, the first of three, the second of two verses; Job's discourse containing four strophes, each of three verses.

2. *The last discourse of Bildad:* ch. xxv. Man can neither argue with God, nor is he pure before Him.

First Strophe: vers. 2-4.—**Dominion and fear are with Him, who maketh peace in His high places.**—הַמְשֵׁל, lit. "to wield dominion, to exercise sovereignty," a substantive Inf. absol. Hiph.; comp. Ewald, § 156, *e.*—[פחד is added in order to set forth the terrible majesty of this sovereignty.—Schlott.]—בִּמְרוֹמָיו cannot be understood as a more precise qualification of the subject: "He in His high places, He who is enthroned in the heights of heaven" (Reimarus, Umbreit, Hahn). It is rather a local qualification of the action affirmed of the subject. It accordingly describes the peace founded by God as established in the heights of heaven, and so having reference to the inhabitants of heaven, and pre-supposing their former strife. Bear in mind what was said above by Job of God's "judging those in heaven" (ch. xxi. 22), and comp. Is. xxiv. 21; also below ch. xxvi. 13.—It is a weakening of the sense which is scarcely justified by the language to understand the passage as teaching God's agency in harmonizing either the elements of the heavenly Kosmos (the perpetually recurring cycle, the wonderfully ordered paths of the stars, comp. Clemens Rom. 1 Cor. xix.), or the discord of the heavenly spirits, conceived of only in the most abstract possible manner, but in truth continually averted by God, and thus as teaching the *maintenance*, not the making or institution, of peace (so Seb. Schmidt, J. Lange, Starke, *etc.*). ["Ewald explains the words of the heavenly powers and spirits represented by the innumerable host of the stars, which might indeed some time be at war among themselves, but which are ever brought again by the Higher Power into order and peace. But nothing whatever is said elsewhere of such a discord as now coming to pass in the upper world. All analogies point rather to a definite fact which is assigned to the beginning of creation." Schlott.].

Ver. 3. **Is there any number to His armies?**—גְּדוּדָיו, synonymous with צְבָאָיו, which is used elsewhere in this sense, are God's hosts or armies, the stars, first of all, indeed, the *heavenly* armies, together with the angels which rule and inhabit them (comp. above on ch. xv. 15). Whether also the lower forces of nature, such as lightnings, winds, *etc.* (comp. ch. xxxviii. 19 seq.; Ps. civ. 4, *etc.*) are intended, as Dillmann thinks is doubtful in view of the indefiniteness of the figurative form of expression. **And upon whom does not His light arise?**—The emphatic suffix *ehu* in אוֹרֵהוּ (comp. עֵינֵיהוּ, ch. xxiv. 23) puts *His* light, to wit God's *own* light, in contrast with the derived lower light of His hosts. The expression is scarcely to be understood of the sunlight, which indeed itself belongs to the number of these גְּדוּדִים: neither can יָקוּם be taken=יִזְרַח (neither here, nor ch. xi. 17). It is inadmissible accordingly to refer the words to the rising sun, as a sign of the fatherly beneficent solicitude of God for His earthly creatures (comp. Matth. v. 45. So against Mercier, Hirz. Hahn, Schlott., *etc.*). We are to understand them rather of that absolutely supraterrestrial light in which God dwells, which He wears as His garment, by which indeed He manifests His being, His heavenly *doxa* (Ps. civ. 2; Ezek. i. 27 seq.; 1 Tim. vi. 16, *etc.*). In respect to this light Bildad asks: "upon whom does it *not* arise?" The question is not: "whom does it not surpass?" ["over whom (*i. e.* which of these beings of light) does it not rise, leaving it behind, and exceeding it in brightness?" Delitzsch], for קוּם would scarcely be appropriate for this thought, since the degree of light is not measured by its height (against Ewald, Heiligst., Del.)—but: "upon whom does it not dispense blessings and happiness?" (Dillm.)

Ver. 4. **How could a mortal be just with God**—(comp. ch. ix. 2): *i. e.* how could he appear before Him, to whose absolute power all heavenly beings are subject, arguing with Him, and making pretensions to righteousness? The second member, with which ch. iv. 17; xv. 14 may be compared, stands connected with the principal thought of the discourse, which immediately follows, to the effect that no man possesses purity or moral spotlessness before God.

Second Strophe: vers. 5-6.

Ver. 5. **Behold, even the moon, it shineth not brightly, and the stars are not pure in His eyes.**—עַד־יָרֵחַ, lit. "even to the moon," *i. e.* even as regards the moon. In the following וְלֹא the וְ is the Vav of the apodosis; comp. Gesen. § 145 [§ 142], 2; and see above ch. xxiii. 12. יַהֵל=יַאֲהִיל from אהל, an alternate form, found only here, of הלל, to be bright, to shine; comp. ch. xxxi. 26. Gekatilia's attempt to render the verb—"to pitch a tent," is inadmissible, for that must have read יַאֲהֶל שָׁם, in order to yield the meaning—"He pitcheth not his tent."—The clause—"in His eyes"—in the second member, belongs also to the first. Comp. the parallel passages already cited in ch. iv. and xv.—Furthermore it is only the physical light, the silver-white streaming *brilliancy* of the stars, which is here put beside the absolute glory of God's light (which is at once physical and ethical). Scarcely is there reference to the angels as inhabiting the stars, and to their moral purity (against Hirzel); from which however nothing can be inferred unfavorable to the theory that the stars, *i. e.*, the heavenly globes of the starry world, are inhabited by angels.

Ver. 6. **Much less then** (אַף כִּי, as in ch.

xv. 16) **mortal man, the worm**, *etc.* In regard to these figures of the maggot and the worm, as setting forth the insignificance, weakness, and contemptibleness of man, comp. Ps. xxii. 7 [6]; also Is. liii. 2, and similar descriptions.

3. *Job's rejoinder:* ch. xxvi. *First Division* (and Strophe): vers. 2-4: Sharp ironical rebuke of Bildad.

Ver. 2. **How hast thou helped the powerless!** מֶה־ here, like מָה, is equivalent to an ironical—"How well! How excellent!" (comp. ch. xix. 28). לֹא־כֹחַ, lit. "no-power" is *abstr. pro conc.*=the powerless; so also in *b* לֹא־עֹז=the strengthless, the feeble; and in ver. 3 *a* לֹא חָכְמָה =the unwise, ignorant. By these three parallel descriptive clauses Job means of course himself, as the object of the well-intended, but perverted attempts of the friends to teach him (not God, as Mercier, Schlottm., *etc.* explain) [as though Bildad had regarded God as too feeble to maintain His own cause. But against this explanation the choice of verbs, if nothing else, would be, as Delitzsch argues, decisive].

Ver. 3. . . . . **and hast declared wisdom in abundance** (לָרֹב, lit. "for multitude") ["an ironical hit at the poverty-stricken brevity of B.'s speech." Dillm.]. תּוּשִׁיָּה, here as in ch. v. 12 may be rendered by "that which is to be accomplished," provided it be referred to the intellectual world, and so understood as *vera et realis sapientia* (J. H. Mich.). Here indeed the word is used ironically of its opposite.

Ver. 4. **To whom hast thou uttered words?**—*i. e.* whom hast thou been desirous of reaching by thy words? for whom were thy elaborate speeches coined? was it, possibly, for me, who have not been touched by them in the least? So correctly the LXX.: τίνι ἀνήγγειλας ῥήματα, and the Vulg.: *quem docere voluisti?* The translation: "*with whose assistance* (אֶת־מִי) hast thou utttered these words?" (Arnh. Hahn) [Con.] seems indeed to be favored by *b*, but is condemned by the construction of the verb הִגִּיד elsewhere in our book with a double accusative (so also ch. xxxi. 37; comp. Ezek. xliii. 10), and does not agree so well with what precedes.—**And whose breath went forth from thee?**—*i. e.* from what kind of inspiration (inbreathing) hast thou spoken? is it the divine? *Num Deo inspirante locutus es?* The question involves a biting irony; for the speech of Bildad, so poor and meagre in thought, merely repeating a little of what Eliphaz had said already, might look accordingly as though it had been inspired by the latter.

4. *Second Division:* vers. 5–14: Eclipsing and surpassing the description given by Bildad of the exaltation and majesty of God by one far more glorious.

Second Strophe: vers. 5–7. While Bildad's description took its start from heaven, and its stars, Job begins by appealing to the realm of shades, together with its subterranean inhabitants as witnesses of the divine omnipotence and majesty, in order from this depth, the lowest foundation of all that is, to mount upward to the heavenly world—**The shades are made to tremble.**—רְפָאִים are not "giants," as the Ancient Versions render the word, but in accordance with the root רפה ("to be slack, relaxed, exhausted," comp. Ewald, § 55, *e*), "weak, powerless," namely, the marrowless and bloodless shades or forms of the underworld, the wretched inhabitants of the realm of the dead; so also in Ps. lxxxviii.; 11 [10]; Prov. ii. 18; ix. 18, and often: Is. xxvi. 14, 19; comp. ch. xiv. 9 seq. [It seems every way reasonable to associate with the idea of weakness, nervelessness, *etc.*, here given to the word that of gigantic stature, when we remember that this same word did denote a race of earthly giants, and that the tendency of the imagination to magnify the spectral forms of the dead is so common, if not universal. So Good: "The spectres of deified heroes were conceived, in the first ages of the world, to be of vast and more than mortal stature, as we learn from the following of Lucretius:

> *Quippe et enim jam tum divûm mortalia secla*
> *Egregias animo facies vigilante videbant;*
> *Et magis in somnis mirando corporis actu.*"

This idea will certainly add to the gloomy sublimity of the description here. Let one imagine the gigantic "marrowless, bloodless phantoms or shades below writhe like a woman in travail as often as the majesty of the heavenly Ruler is felt by them, as perhaps by the raging of the sea, or the quaking of the earth." Delitzsch. "That even these beings, although otherwise without feeling or motion, and situated at an immeasurable distance from God's dwelling-place are sensible of the effects of God's activity,—this is a much stronger witness to God's greatness than aught that B. had alleged." Hirzel]. Of these shades, living far from God in the depths under the earth and under the seas (comp. *b:* "beneath the waters and their inhabitants"), it is here said: "they are put in terror, they are made to tremble and quake" (יְחוֹלָלוּ, Pul. from חול, comp. Ewald, § 141 *b*), an expression which, like Ps. cxxxix. 8; Prov. xv. 11, is intended to describe the energy of the divine omnipotence as illimitable and filling all things, extending even down to Sheol. Comp. also James ii. 19, a passage otherwise related to the one before us, and perhaps suggested by it, but having a different purpose. [The rendering of E. V. needs but to be compared with the above to show how erroneous and unsatisfactory it is.—E.].

Ver. 6. **Naked is the underworld before Him** (comp. Heb. iv. 13: πάντα δὲ γυμνὰ καὶ τετραχηλισμένα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ), **and the abyss of hell has no covering** (for Him). Comp. on Prov. xv. 11, a passage parallel to this in matter, where אֲבַדּוֹן (lit. "destruction, annihilation") stands precisely as here as a synonym of שְׁאֹל; also Ps. cxxxix. 8, and below ch. xxxviii. 17. [The definition, "destruction, annihilation" here given for אבדון is of course not to be understood in the metaphysical sense of the extinction of being. It is the destruction *of life*, as enjoyed on the face of the earth; the extinction of light, the derangement

of order, the wasting away of all vital energy and beauty. Hence as שְׁאוֹל describes the underworld as the *insatiable receptacle* of the departed, demanding and drawing men into itself, *orcus rapax*, אֲבַדּוֹן gives us a glimpse yet deeper into its abysmal horrors, its destructive, wasting potencies. Hence the fearful significance with which in Rev. (ix. 11) it is applied, as the Hebrew equivalent to the Greek Apollyon, to the angel of the bottomless pit.—E.].

Ver. 7. **Who stretcheth out the northern heavens over empty space.**—The Participles in this and the two following verses attach themselves to God, the logical subject of the ver. preceding [and are used to describe the divine activity herein specified as continuous]. Our rendering of צָפוֹן in the sense of the northern heavens, the northern half of the heavenly vault, has decisively in its favor the verb נטה, which is never used of the stretching out or expansion of the earth, or a part of it, but always of the out-stretching of the heavenly vault, which is conceived of as a tent; comp. chap. ix. 8; Is. xl. 22; xliv. 24; Zech. xii. 1; Ps. civ. 2, *etc.* It would be singular, moreover, if Job had first mentioned only a part of the earth, the northern, and not until afterwards had mentioned it as a whole, however true it might be that the popular notion of oriental antiquity, which represented the north of the earth as a part of it which abounded most in mountains, and was highest and heaviest, would seem to favor this view (against Hirzel, Ewald, Heiligst., Schlottmann, Dillmann). [Ewald calls attention to the corresponding Hindu notion concerning the north. Schlottmann thinks such a reference to the north as the heaviest part of the earth best suited to the connection. Dillmann argues that it could not properly be affirmed of the heavens, that they are stretched out over the תֹהוּ]. The reference of צָפוֹן to the northern *hemisphere of the heavens* (Umbreit, Vaih., Hahn., Olsh., Del., *etc.*) is favored also by this considetion in addition to those already mentioned, that all the more important constellations which our book mentions (the Bear, Pleiades, *etc.*) belong to this northern hemisphere, and that moreover among other people of the ancient world, the "pole" (*i. e.* the north pole), and "heaven," are used as synonyms; so especially among the Romans (Varro, *de L. L.* vii. 2, § 14; Ovid, *Fast.* 6, 278; Horace, and other poets). The correct view was substantially given by Brentius: Synecdoche, a part for the whole; for Aquino, which is Septentrio [North] is used for the whole heaven or firmament. **Hangeth the earth upon nothing:** בְּלִימָה, not anything [lit. "not-what"]=nothing, here substantially synonymous with "the empty space," תֹהוּ (comp. Gen. i. 2), hence denoting the endless empty space in which the earth (which according to ver. 10 is conceived of as a flat disk, rather than as a ball), together with the overarching northern heavens, hangs freely. The cosmological conception of the suspension of the earth in the empty space of the universe (with which may be compared parallel representations from the classics, such as Lucretius II., 600 seq., Ovid, *Fast.* II., 269 seq.) does not conflict with the mention of the "pillars of the earth" in ch. ix. 6, for the reason that the "pillars" are conceived of as the inner roots or bones, the skeleton as it were of the body of the earth. It is only quite indirectly that the passage before us can be used to prove the creation of the world out of nothing. We may suggest as worthy of note the descriptions, which remind us of the one before us, in the more recent oriental poets, as *e. g.* the Persian Ferideddin Attar (in v. Hammer, *Geschichte der schönen Redekünste Persiens*, p. 141, 143):

> "Pillarless he spreads out the heavens
> A canopy above the earth . . . . .
> What bears the atmosphere? 'Tis nothing,
> Nothing on nothing, and only nothing;"

also the Arabian Audeddin Alnasaph (*de religione Sonnitar.*, princ. v. 2):

"Out of a breath He made the heavens;" and already in the Koran, in its Sur. 13, v. 2, it is said: "It is Allah, who has built the heavens on high, without founding it on visible pillars." Comp. Umbreit on the ver.

Third Strophe: vers. 8-10. **Who bindeth up** (or "shuts in," comp. Prov. xxx. 4, *c*) **the waters in His clouds:** which accordingly are regarded as vessels [bags, bottles, *etc.*] or transparent enclosures for the waters of the heavens above: **without the clouds bursting under them** (the waters); *i. e.* so that the weight of these masses of water does not cause them to pour themselves forth in torrents of rain out of their cloud-vessels, implying that this is as God expressly wills and orders it; comp. Gen. vii. 11; viii. 2. ["By which nothing more or less is meant than that the physical and meteorological laws of rain are of God's appointment." Del.].

Ver. 9 ["describes the dark and thickly clouded sky that showers down the rain in the appointed rainy season." Del.] **Who enshroudeth the outside of His throne**—lit. "of the throne," for כִּסֵּה, as in 1 Kings x. 19 is for כִּסֵּא, scarcely, as Hirzel thinks, by an error of transcription for כִּסְאֹה. But unquestionably "the throne" is simply="*His* throne," God's throne in heaven (comp. Is. lxvi. 1; Matt. v. 34). It is said of the face or outside (פְּנֵי) of this throne, *i. e.*, that side of it which is turned towards this earth, that God "encloses" or "enshrouds" it by causing the clouds to come between it and the earth. מְאַחֵז, Piel from אחז, used here of the *artificial* veiling, or unclosing, draping it as it were) ["אחז signifies to take hold of, in architecture to hold together by means of beams, or to fasten together. . . then also as usually in Chald. and Syr. to shut (by means of cross-bars, Neh. vii. 3), here to shut off by surrounding with clouds." Del. Hence not exactly "to hold back," E. V. but to "fasten up." Merx understands the verb of bearing, holding up, and the verse to set forth the miracle that God bears up the throne on which He sits. But in that case פני would be superfluous. E.]. **Spreading over it His clouds**—this member of the verse explaining the former. עָלָיו refers to פְּנֵי כִסְאוֹ, and the quadril. verb

פַּרְשֵׁז is Inf. Absol. and may thus be rendered in Latin by *expendendo*, in our language by the Pres. Active Participle (comp. Ew. § 141, *c;* and Del. on the ver.) [According to others, *e.g.*, Dillmann, Green, § 189 *a*, the vb. is preterite. Gesenius (Lex) regards the quadriliteral as a mixed form, from פרש and פרז. Delitzsch argues forcibly against this, and regards it as an intensive form of פרש, formed by prosthesis, and an Arabic change of Sin into Shin.]

Ver. 10 [passes from the waters above to the waters below]. **He hath rounded off** (encircled, חָג, comp. the ἐγύρωσεν of the LXX.) **a bound** (חֹק as in ch. xiv. 5) **for the face of the water, to the ending of the light beside the darkness**: or "to the extremity" (the confines, the boundary line) of the light with the darkness, *ad lucis usque tenebrarumque confinia* (Pareau). So correctly Del. and Dill. [E. V. Con., Words., Carey, Renan., Rod. Merx], while most moderns (Rosenm., Ewald, Hirz., Schlottm., Hahn, *etc.*) take עַד־תַּכְלִית by itself in an adverbial sense, "most perfectly, most accurately," (comp. ch. xxviii. 3), take אוֹר either as a remoter accus. of חג (so Hirz.), or as Genit. to חֹק, standing at the head of the clause in the construct state (so Ewald). In either case, however, we get a construction which is much too harsh. As proving that עַד־תַּכְלִית is by no means necessarily used adverbially, comp. above ch. xi. 7. The meaning of the verse will be rightly apprehended only by referring it *not* to the limit *in time* between light and darkness, *i. e.* to the regular succession of day and night (Schlottm.), but to the limit *in space*, the line separating between the light and dark regions of the heavenly circle, which runs along the surface of the waters of the ocean, encircling the earth. "That is to say this description, like that in Prov. viii. 27, has for its basis the conception, prevalent also among the classic nations, and down into the middle ages, that the earth is encompassed all around by water, or a sea,—that upon this earth-encircling ocean is marked out the circle of the celestial hemisphere, along which the sun and stars run their course (so that a part of the water lies within this circle)—that the region of the stars, of the light, lies inside of this circle, and that the region of darkness begins outside of it; comp. Voss on Virg. *Georg.* I., 240 seq." Dillm.

Fourth Strophe: vers. 11-13.—**The pillars of heaven are made to tremble, and are astonished at His rebuke.**—"Pillars of heaven" is the name which the poet gives to the mountains towering upon high, which seem as it were to bear up the arch of heaven; comp. the ancient classic legend of Atlas, and see above on ch. ix. 6. In speaking of these pillars as "moved to trembling" (יְרוֹפָפוּ, Piel. from רוּף, τινάσσειν) ["the signification of violent and quick motion backwards and forwards is secured to the verb" by forms in the Targ., Talm. and Arabic.—Del.], and as fleeing in astonishment before God's rebuking thunder (comp. Ps. civ. 7; Is. l. 2; Nah. i. 4), the poet describes here the phenomenon of an earthquake, or that of a tremendous thunderstorm (comp. Ps. xxix.; also Rev. vi. 12 seq.; xx. 11).

Ver. 12. **By His power He frightens up the sea.**—רגע here not intransitive as in ch. vii. 5; but transitive in the sense of "frightening up, arousing," ταράσσειν (comp. Is. li. 15; Jer. xxxi. 35); hardly in the sense of intimidating, or putting at rest, as some expositors (Umbreit, Dillm. [Conant, Carey, Rod.], *etc.*) render the verb after the LXX. (κατέπαυσεν). [E. V. "divideth" (and so Bernard) here, and in all the passages cited: but unsupported and less suitably.]—**And by His understanding He smites Rahab in pieces.**—Comp. on ch. ix. 13, where already it was shown to be necessary to understand רַהַב (LXX.: τὸ κῆτος) of a colossal demon-monster of legendary antiquity (not of Egypt, nor of the raging fury of the sea, to which מחץ, "to shatter, to dash in pieces" would not be suitable).

Ver. 13. **By His breath the heavens become bright**: lit. "are brightness," שִׁפְרָה, a substantive found only here, which, however, does not denote a permanent quality of the heavens (Rosenm.), but one that is transiently [occasionally] produced by God [by His breath He scatters the clouds, and brightens the face of heaven]; **His hand hath pierced the fleeing serpent.**—חֹלְלָה, Po. from חלל, Is. li. 9, hence *perforavit, trucidavit;* not Pil. from חול or חיל, so that it would express the idea of forming, creating as the Targ., Jer., Rosenm., Arnh., Vaih., Welte, Renan [E. V., Con., Noy., Ber., Rod.], explain. For here again the discourse treats not of a *creative* energy of God, but of one that is exercised as a part of the established order of nature, and in all probability it discusses the same theme as that to which ch. iii. 8 refers, to wit, *the production of eclipses of the sun and moon.* For the popular superstition prevalent at the time of the composition of our book conceived of this phenomenon as consisting in the attempt of a dragon-like dark monster to swallow up these luminaries, accompanied by an intervention of God, who slays or strangles this monster ["so that it was customary to say, when the sun or moon was eclipsed: 'The Dragon, or the Flying Serpent, has wound around it;' and on the other hand when it was released from the obscuration: 'God has killed the Dragon.'" Dillm.] It is to this exercise of God's power, bringing deliverance, that the clause חֹלְלָה יָדוֹ refers, while נָחָשׁ בָּרִחַ (the same expression also in Is. xxvii. 1) denotes the monster referred to, which is represented as seized upon in the act of fleeing (before God), hence as "a fugitive, fleeing serpent." In that parallel passage in Isaiah, the LXX. rightly translate by ὄφιν φεύγοντα, while their rendering in the passage before us, δράκοντα ἀποστάτην, whether we regard the language or the thought, is equally inadmissible with the *coluber tortuosus* of the Vulg. [followed by E. V. "crooked serpent"], or the *serpentem vectem* of the same version in Is. xxvii. 1 (comp. the ὄφιν συγκλείοντα, "the barring serpent," of Symmachus).

Ver. 14. A recapitulating closing verse, standing outside of the schema of strophes.—**Lo, these** (אֵלֶּה pointing backwards, as in ch. xviii. 21) **are the ends of His ways**; or, "of His way," according to the K'thibh; the same wavering between דַּרְכּוֹ and דְּרָכָיו to be seen also in Prov. viii. 22. The "ends" or "borders" (Delitzsch) [Conant, Words., *etc.*,] of God's ways are the extreme outlines of what He is doing in governing the world, those intimations of His heavenly activity which are lowest, and nearest, and most immediately accessible to our power of apprehension.—**And what a faintly whispering word** (it is) **that we hear!**—וּמַה־שֵּׁמֶץ דָּבָר, lit. "and what a whisper of a word." For this combination of מָה with a substantive in apposition, comp. Ps. xxx. 10; Is. xl. 18; and for שָׁמַע with בְּ of the attentive hearing of anything, see above ch. xxi. 2; also ch. xxxvii. 2; Gen. xxvii. 5; Ps. xcii. 12. Against the partitive rendering of בּוֹ, advocated by Schlott. and Delitzsch, may be urged the plur. form דְּרָכָיו, preferred by the Masoretes, as well as the probability that to express this meaning the preposition מִן would rather have been used. [Here again, as in ch. iv. 12, the incorrect rendering of E. V.: "How *little a portion* is heard of Him," mars the poetic beauty and graphic contrast of the passage. On שֶׁמֶץ Wordsworth remarks: "We feel as it were a zephyr of God's Presence walking in the garden of this world in the cool of the day."]—**But the thunder of His omnipotence** (according to the K'ri גְּבוּרֹתָיו, "his energies") **who can understand?** *i. e.* the full, unmodified manifestation of His energies, the unsmothered "thunder-course" of His heavenly spheres (comp. what Raphael says in the Prologue to Faust) would be unbearable by us, frail, sinful children of earth. ["Job could not have uttered in nobler language his deep feeling of the degree in which the divine glory surpasses all human knowledge. There resounds in it in truth an echo of the far-off divine thunder itself, and before this the poet has the friends now become entirely dumb." Schlottm.]

DOCTRINAL, ETHICAL AND HOMILETICAL.

1. That which Bildad brings forward against Job in ch. xxv. is so meagre, and possesses so little novelty, that it may be said, that in his discourse the opposition of the friends dies the death of exhaustion, and that the bitter irony of Job's rejoinder to it seems fully justified. For the real problem which underlies the whole controversy—the great mystery touching the frequency with which the innocent suffer, which Job had again set forth so eloquently just before—that problem Bildad certainly does not consider. He avoids indeed those bitter personalities and odious accusations against Job with which Eliphaz had made his exit just before in a manner that was altogether unworthy, and takes his leave of the sufferer, whom he himself also had heretofore violently assailed, in a way that is relatively friendly—in a way in which the final peaceful termination of the conflict (ch. xlii. 7-9) is remotely intimated. That which Bildad actually brings forward is a truth which does not at all touch the real point at issue, which Job himself has on former occasions expressly conceded (see ch. ix. 2; xiv. 4), the same truth which Eliphaz had in his first two discourses prominently emphasized, and in the renewed statement of which, at this time, Bildad closely copies even the expressions of his older associate. He "only reminds Job of the universal sinfulness of the human race once again, without direct accusation, in order that Job may himself derive from it the admonition to humble himself; and this admonition Job really needs, for his speeches are in many ways contrary to that humility which is still the duty of sinful man, even in connection with the best justified consciousness of right thoughts and actions towards the holy God" (Del.).

2. Of the fact that Job is still wanting in proper humility, and in a profound perception of sin, he at once proceeds to give evidence in his rejoinder in ch. xxvi. In this he appears as decisively victorious over his opponents, who have shown themselves totally unequal to the problem to be solved, while he, by his emphatic reference to the incomprehensibleness and unsearchableness of God's ways, had made at least an important advance towards its solution, and had shown his appreciation of *the mystery as such* in its entire significance. But he makes his vanquished opponents duly sensible of this superiority which he had over them, when in replying to Bildad, the last speaker of the number, he wields the weapon of sarcasm in a way that is altogether merciless, and seeks to humiliate him by a eulogy of the divine omnipotence and exaltation which is visibly intended to surpass and eclipse that which had been said by him. It is true indeed that this very description in its incomparable grandeur gives us to understand clearly enough how entirely filled and carried away Job is by its infinitely elevated theme, and how by virtue of his flight to this height of an inspired contemplation of God, every thought respecting the unrelenting, or even vindictive persecution of his opponents disappears, so that the closing reference to the unattainable height and glory of the divine nature and activity (ver. 14) is unaccompanied by any expression whatever of triumphant pride, or bitter enjoyment of their discomfiture (comp. V. Gerlach below, Homiletic Remarks on ch. xxvi. 2 seq.). The pure and undivided enthusiasm with which he surrenders himself to the contemplation of the Divine has manifestly an ennobling, purifying, and elevating influence on his spirit. It shows that he is not far removed at length from the goal of a perfectly correct and true solution of the dark mystery which occupies him. It makes it apparent that essentially one thing is lacking to him that he may press upward through the dark scenes of his conflict to the light of pure truth and peace with God, and that is—a humble submission beneath the dealings of the only wise and true God, dealings which are righteous even towards him, sincere repentance and confession

of the errors and failures of which he had been guilty even during the hot conflict of suffering through which he had passed, that "repenting in dust and ashes" to which God's treatment brought him at last, as one who had been afflicted by his Heavenly Father, not indeed in accordance with the ordinary standard of retribution, but nevertheless not unjustly, not without a remedial and loving purpose.

3. That which is of greatest interest in the two short sections preceding not only to the scientific, but also to the practical and homiletic expositor, are those elements of a poetic cosmology and physical theology, which in Bildad's discourse are presented more briefly and more in the way of suggestion, but which in that of Job are exhibited in a more developed and comprehensive form. It is that material which at an earlier day was treated by Baur in his *Systema Mundi Jobæum* (Hal. 1707), Scheuchzer in his *Jobi Physica Sacra*, *etc.*, and which to this day is a theme of no small interest in its theological aspects as well as in those related to cosmology and the history of civilization. The fact that certain mythological representations, and in particular a few traces of astronomical myths, are scattered over this magnificent picture of creation, and that the teachings of modern science concerning the mechanism of the heavens cannot be derived from it, cannot injure the peculiarly high value of the description, nor destroy its utility for practical purposes. It is in any case a view of the universe of incontrovertible grandeur, which in all that is described in ch. xxvi. 5-13 beholds only the "fringes" of God's glory as they hang over on earth (comp. Is. vi. 1), only a few meagre lineaments of the entire divine manifestation, only a muffled murmur echoing from afar off as a poor substitute for the thunder of His omnipotence. And in respect to the purity and correctness of its representations in detail, this physical theology of Job ranks sufficiently high, as is shown by that which is said of "hanging the earth upon nothing" (ver. 7), a description of the fact no less surprising than the following descriptions of meteorological and geological processes are poetically bold and elevated.

Particular Passages.

Ch. xxv. 4 seq. Cocceius: Although in our eyes the stars may seem καθαρόν τι στίλβειν (to shine with some degree of purity), nevertheless even they are outside of God's habitation, being esteemed unworthy to adorn His dwelling-place. . . . How therefore can miserable man, who is mortal and diseased and liable to death, who is a son of Adam, who is no worthier than a worm, or a grub, who is made of earth, who crawls on the earth, who lives by the earth, who is at once foul and defiled, ... who in a word is as far below the stars, as the worm is below himself—how shall he dare or be able to face God in His court, and on equal terms to argue with Him? Let him, along with the moon and the stars, keep himself in his own station, and he will enjoy God's favors; but let him attempt to exalt himself, and he will be crushed by the weight of the divine majesty.—V. Gerlach: As the hosts of heaven are types of the pure spirits of heaven, so is their brightness a type of the holiness of the inhabitants of heaven, just as immediately after (in ver. 6) the mortality and wretchedness of man is a type of his sinfulness. In this contra-position there lies a profound truth: Holiness and shining brightness, and sin and death's corruption correspond to each other. In his frailty and mortality man has an incessant reminder of his sin and corruption; in seeing his outward lot he should humble himself inwardly before God.

Ch. xxvi. 2-4. Wohlfarth: After that Job has ironically shown to his friend the irrelevancy of his reply, he takes a nobler revenge upon him, by delivering a much worthier eulogy on God's exalted greatness, of which notwithstanding and during his suffering he has a most vivid and penetrating conviction.—V. Gerlach: Job's frame of mind bordering on pride, which causes him altogether to misunderstand that which is glorious and exalted in Bildad's last discourse, belongs to the earthly folly which clings to him, which is to be stripped away from him by the sufferings and conflicts of his inner man, and which does at last really fall away from him. The splendid description which follows, and especially its humble conclusion (ver. 14), proves in the meanwhile that the fundamental disposition of Job's heart was different from that which the particular expressions uttered by him in his more despondent moods would seem to indicate.

Ch. xxvi. 7 seq. Brentius: The fact that God stretches out the heavens, and supports the earth, without the aid of pillars, is a great argument in proof of His power (Ps. cii. 26). The poets relate that Atlas supports heaven on his shoulders; but we acknowledge the true Atlas, the Lord our God, who by His word supports both heaven and earth.—Wohlfarth: The look to heaven which Job here requires us to take, does not indeed reach upwards to the throne of the Eternal (ver. 7 seq.). But although we cannot now behold Him, who dwells in His inaccessible light, we can nevertheless feel His nearness, recognize His existence, experience His influence, see His greatness and majesty, when we pray to Him as the Being who stretches out the heavens above the earth like a tent, at whose beckoning the clouds open and water the thirsty earth, who has given to the water its bounds, *etc.* As the work bears witness to its master, so does the universe to its Creator, Preserver, and Ruler (Ps. xix. 5); and no despairing one has ever beheld the eternal order which stands before him, and its mysterious, but ever beneficent movements, no sinner desiring salvation has ever tarried in the courts of this great temple of God, without being richly dowered with heavenly blessings

Ch. xxvi. 14. Oecolampadius: These tokens of divine power however great will nevertheless rightly be esteemed small, as being hardly a slight whisper in comparison with the mighty thunder. There is nothing therefore so frightful, but faith will be able to endure it, when it thus exercises itself in the works of God's power, especially with the word of promise added.—Wohlfarth: We can survey only the smallest portion of God's immeasurable realm! What is the knowledge of the greatest sages but the

short-sighted vision of a worm! Our earth is a grain of sand in the All, the "drop of a bucket," as the prophet says; and how little do we know of Him; how great is the sum of that which is hidden from us! (1 Cor. xiii. 9 seq.).

III. Job alone: His closing address to the vanquished friends. Chap. XXVII—XXVIII.

a. Renewed asseveration of his innocence, accompanied by a reference to his joy in God, which had not forsaken him even in the midst of his deepest misery. Chap. xxvii. 1–10.

1 Moreover Job continued his parable, and said:

2 As God liveth, who hath taken away my judgment;
and the Almighty, who hath vexed my soul;
3 all the while my breath is in me,
and the spirit of God is in my nostrils;—
4 my lips shall not speak wickedness
nor my tongue utter deceit.

5 God forbid that I should justify you:
till I die I will not remove mine integrity from me.
6 My righteousness I hold fast, I will not let it go:
my heart shall not reproach me so long as I live.
7 Let mine enemy be as the wicked,
and he that riseth up against me as the unrighteous.

8 For what is the hope of the hypocrite, though he hath gained,
when God taketh away his soul?
9 Will God hear his cry
when trouble cometh upon him?
10 Will he delight himself in the Almighty?
will he always call upon God?

b. Statement of his belief that the prosperity of the ungodly cannot endure, but that they must infallibly come to a terrible end. Vers. 11-23.

11 I will teach you by the hand of God;
that which is with the Almighty will I not conceal.
12 Behold, all ye yourselves have seen it;
why then are ye thus altogether vain?
13 This is the portion of a wicked man with God,
and the heritage of oppressors, which they shall receive of the Almighty.
14 If his children be multiplied, it is for the sword;
and his offspring shall not be satisfied with bread.
15 Those that remain of him shall be buried in death;
and his widows shall not weep.
16 Though he heap up silver as the dust,
and prepare raiment as the clay;
17 he may prepare it, but the just shall put it on,
and the innocent shall divide the silver.
18 He buildeth his house as a moth,
and as a booth that the keeper maketh.

19 The rich man shall lie down, but he shall not be gathered;
he openeth his eyes, and he is not!
20 Terrors take hold on him as waters,
a tempest stealeth him away in the night.

21 The east wind carrieth him away, and he departeth:
and as a storm hurleth him out of his place.
22 For God shall cast upon him, and not spare:
He would fain flee out of his hand.
23 Men shall clap their hands at him,
and hiss him out of his place.

c. Declaration that true Wisdom, which alone can secure real well-being, and a correct solution of the dark enigmas of man's destiny, is to be found nowhere on earth, but only with God, and by means of a pious submission to God. Chap. xxviii.

1 Surely there is a vein for the silver,
and a place for gold where they fine it.
2 Iron is taken out of the earth.
and brass is molten out of the stone.
3 He setteth an end to darkness,
and searcheth out all perfection:
the stones of darkness, and the shadow of death.
4 The flood breaketh out from the inhabitants;
even the waters forgotten of the foot:
they are dried up, they are gone away from men.
5 As for the earth, out of it cometh bread:
and under it is turned up as it were fire.
6 The stones of it are the place of sapphires:
and it hath dust of gold.
7 There is a path which no fowl knoweth,
and which the vulture's eye hath not seen.
8 The lion's whelps have not trodden it
nor the fierce lion passed by it.
9 He putteth forth his hand upon the rock;
10 He cutteth out rivers among the rocks;
and his eye seeth every precious thing.
he overturneth the mountains by the roots.
11 He bindeth the floods from overflowing;
and the thing that is hid bringeth he forth to light.

12 But where shall wisdom be found?
and where is the place of understanding?
13 Man knoweth not the price thereof:
neither is it found in the land of the living.
14 The depth saith, It is not in me;
and the sea saith, It is not with me.
15 It cannot be gotten for gold,
neither shall silver be weighed for the price thereof.
16 It cannot be valued with the gold of Ophir,
with the precious onyx, or the sapphire.
17 The gold and the crystal cannot equal it:
and the exchange of it shall not be for jewels of fine gold.
18 No mention shall be made of coral, or of pearls;
for the price of wisdom is above rubies.
19 The topaz of Ethiopia shall not equal it,
neither shall it be valued with pure gold.
20 Whence then cometh wisdom?
and where is the place of understanding?
21 Seeing it is hid from the eyes of all living,
and kept close from the fowls of the air.
22 Destruction and death say,
we have heard the fame thereof with our ears.

23 God understandeth the way thereof,
and He knoweth the place thereof.

24 For He looketh to the ends of the earth,
and seeth under the whole heaven ;
25 to make the weight for the winds;
and He weigheth the waters by measure.
26 When He made a decree for the rain,
and a way for the lightning of the thunder;
27 Then did He see it, and declare it ;
He prepared it, yea, and searched it out.
28 And unto man He said :
Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom;
and to depart from evil is understanding.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Inasmuch as the opposition of the friends is silenced, before the last of the number attempts a third reply, the victor, after a short pause, takes up his discourse, "in order that, by collecting himself after the passion of the strife, he might express with greater calmness and clearness the convictions which have been formed within him as results of the colloquy thus far, and so to give to the colloquy the internal solution which was wanting" (Dillm.). It is not so much a triumphant self-contemplation, or a pathetic monologue, that he delivers, but a genuine *didactic discourse*, addressed to the vanquished friends, which, like the discourses of the previous discussion, is cast in the form, characteristic of the Chokmah, of a series of proverbs. It is hence expressly termed in the introductory verse (ch. xxvii. 1) a continuation of the "Mashal, *i. e.* of the proverbial discourse" (in regard to שְׂאֵת מָשָׁל, "to utter, lit. to raise a proverb;" comp. Num. xxiii. 7, where the same expression is applied to a prophetic *vaticinium* of Balaam's). ["מָשָׁל is speech of a more elevated tone and more figurative character; here, as frequently, the unaffected outgrowth of an elevated solemn mood. The introduction of the ultimatum as מָשָׁל reminds one of "the proverb (*el-methel*) seals it in the mouth of the Arab, since in common life it is customary to use a pithy saying as the final proof at the conclusion of a speech." Delitzsch.]—The following are the contents of this proverbial discourse, which is somewhat extended, and which, especially in its last principal division, is exceedingly lofty and poetic: (1) An emphatic asseveration of his own innocence, which he has made repeatedly during the previous colloquy, and which he now puts forth as attested by his continued experience of God's friendship, and his joy in God (ch. xxvii. 2-10); (2) A description —imitating and surpassing the similar descriptions of the friends in chs. xv.; xviii.; xx., *etc.* —of the fearful divine judgment, which must of necessity overtake the ungodly, and in view of which he indeed has every reason to adhere earnestly and zealously to God's ways (ch. xxvii. 11-23); (3) An exhibition of the nature of true wisdom, which alone can furnish correct solutions of the dark enigmas of this earthly life, and which is here set forth as a blessing absolutely supra-sensual, to be obtained only through God, and the closest union with Him (ch. xxviii.). —These three sections are differently divided, the two former consisting of three short strophes (of three to five verses), the third of three long strophes (two of eleven, and one of six verses).

2. *First Section:* The asseveration of his innocence: ch. xxvii. 2-10.

First Strophe: vers. 2-4.—**As God liveth** (lit. "living is God!" a well-known Hebrew, and also Arabic formula of adjuration) [the only place where Job resorts to the oath], **who hath taken away from me my right, and the Almighty who hath vexed my soul**; lit. "who hath made bitter my soul" (LXX.: ὁ πικρώσας, comp. Col. iii. 19: πικραίνεσθαι).

Ver. 3. **For still all my breath is in me, and God's breath is in my nostrils,** *i. e.* I am still possessed of enough freshness and vigor of spirit to know what I say, to be a responsible witness in behalf of my innocence. The older expositors, and among the moderns Schlottmann [Good, Noyes, Conant, Bernard, Carey, Rodwell, Elzas, Renan, Merx, and so E. V.] take the verse not as a parenthetic reason for the adjuration in ver. 2, but as the antecedent of ver. 4: "so long as my breath is yet in me," *etc.* But in that case the contents of the oath would have a double introduction, first by כִּי, then by אִם. Moreover the words כָּל־עוֹד נִשְׁמָתִי בִי, as the parallel passages, 2 Sam. i. 9; Hos. xiv. 3, show, have not in the least the appearance of an adverbial antecedent determination of time.—[The older rendering is certainly to be preferred. (1) It expresses a thought much more suitable for incorporation into an oath. "As God lives —while I live—I will speak only the truth"—is natural. "As God lives—and I take this oath because I am fully competent to stand up to what I am swearing—my lips shall not," *etc.*— is decidedly unnatural. (2) The *language* at once suggests the simple idea of *living*—"breath (נשמתי) yet in me—the breath of Eloah *in my nostril.*" This is scarcely the language one would use in describing a *particular inward* condition. (3) כִּי is simply transitional, introducing after the oath a thought preparatory to the principal thought introduced by אִם, a construction which Delitzsch admits to be possible, though what there is perplexing in it, it is difficult to see. (4) כָּל־ is used adverbially as in Ps. xxxix. 6; xlv. 14; Eccles. v. 15; here— "wholly as long as" (see Gesenius and Fürst). It thus strengthens the expression in a way that

is altogether appropriate to the strong feeling which prompts the *oath*.—E.]

Ver. 4 gives the contents of the oath, which the following verses unfold still more specifically and comprehensively. In regard to עַוְלָה, lit. "perverseness," hence "falsehood, untruthfulness," and its synonym רְמִיָּה, comp. ch. xiii. 7.

Second Strophe: vers. 5-7.—**Far be it from me** (lit. "for a profanation be it to me," comp. Ew. § 329, *a*) **to grant that you are in the right**:—wherein is seen in the second member—**until I die I will not let my innocence be taken away from me** (lit. "I will not let it depart from me"), *i. e.* I will not cease from asserting it continually.

Ver. 6. In regard to הִרְפָּה in *a*, meaning "to let something go, to let it fall," comp. ch. vii. 19.—**My heart reproacheth not one of my days.**—חרף, lit. "to pluck, to pick off," *carpere, vellicare.* לֵבָב here is unquestionably synonymous substantially with "conscience." So Luther translated it both here and in Josh. xiv. 7; comp. also 1 Sam. xxiv. 6 [5]; 2 Sam. xxiv. 10, where it may also be translated "conscience" (see in general Vilmar, *Theolog. Moral.* I., p. 66). Most modern commentators rightly take מִן in מִיָּמָי, as partitive—"one of my days;" the temporal rendering of the expression adopted by the ancients, as also by Ewald (=while I live, *in omni vita mea*, Vulg.) [E. V.], necessitates the harsh and scarcely admissible rendering of יֶחֱרַף as intransitive, or as reflexive ("does not blame itself," Ewald) [E. V. supplies "me"]. It remains to be said, that this asseveration of innocence (like that in ch. xxiii. 10 seq.) is, in some measure, exaggerated, when compared with the mention which Job makes earlier of "the sins of his youth," ch. xiii. 26.

Ver. 7. **Mine enemy must appear as the wicked, and mine adversary as the unrighteous**: *viz.* as the penalty of their falsely suspecting and disputing my innocence. Only this optative rendering of the Jussive יְהִי is suited to the context, not the concessive: "though mine enemy be an evil-doer, I am none" (Hirz.). As to מִתְקוֹמֵם, comp. ch. xx. 27; Ps. lix. 2. ["The idea conveyed in אֹיֵב is *hostility of feeling;* in מִתְקוֹמֵם, *hostility of action*, and that *initiative.* It is, to some extent, expressive of unprovoked assault." Carey.]

Third Strophe: vers. 8-10.—**For what is the hope of an ungodly man when He cutteth off, when Eloah draweth out his soul?**—This question is to be understood from the two former discourses of Job, in which, when confronting death he placed his hope with animated emphasis on God, as his final deliverer and avenger (chs. xvii. and xix.). In contrast with such a joyful hope reaching out beyond death, the evil-doer has *nothing* more to hope for, when once God has cut off his thread of life, and drawn out his soul out of the mortal body enclosing it (יֵשֶׁל Imperf. apoc. Kal. from שָׁלָה, *extrahere*, cognate with שלל and נשל). The figurative expression: "cutting off the soul," has always for its basis the same conception of the body as a tent, and of the internal thread of life as the tent-cord, which we came across in ch. iv. 21. Possibly the expression: "drawing out" has the same explanation, although this seems to have rather for its basis the comparison of the body to a *sheath* for the soul (Dan. vii. 15), so that accordingly we have a transition from one figure to another. [E. V. (after the Vulgate, Syr., Targ.), Gesenius in Thes., Fürst, Con., Ber., Merx, Rod., Elz., translate כִּי יִבְצָע "though he hath gained" scil. riches, or "though he despoil." The meaning "to plunder" or "gain" is certainly more in harmony with the usage of the verb in Kal, and avoids the mixture of metaphor according to the other construction.—E.]

Vers. 9, 10. **Will God hear his cry? . . . Can he delight himself in the Almighty?** *etc.* The meaning of these questions is that to him there shall be neither the hearing of his prayers, nor a joyful, trustful and loving fellowship with God (הִתְעַנֵּג as in ch. xxii. 26). Job accordingly claims for himself both these things (comp. ch. xiii. 16), and thereby leaves out of the account transient obscurations of his spirit, like that in consequence of which he mourns (ch. xix. 7) that his prayer is not heard.

3. *Second Section:* Description of the inevitable overthrow of the wicked: vers. 11-23. The striking correspondence which this description by Job seems at first sight to exhibit with the well-known descriptions of the friends, especially in the second series of the colloquy, and this notwithstanding the fact that Job himself only just before, in chs. xxi. and xxiv., has maintained the happiness of the wicked to the end of their life, have led some to assume a transposition, or confusion of the text (Kennicott, Stuhlmann, Bernstein, [Bernard, Wemyss, Elzas]; comp. Introd. § 9, 1); others, to suppose that Job is here simply repeating the opinion of his opponents, without purposing to make it his own (Eichhorn, *Das Buch Hiob übers., etc.*, 1824; Böckel, 2d Ed. 1830). But the contradiction to Job's former utterances is only apparent, for: (1) The opinion that the prosperity of the wicked cannot endure has been repeatedly put forth even by himself, at least in principle (comp. ch. xxi. 16; xxiii. 15; xxiv. 12; comp. also below ch. xxxi. 3 seq.). (2) The erroneous and objectionably one-sided utterances regarding God as a hard-hearted persecutor of innocence, and author of the prosperity of many evil-doers, which he has heretofore frequently put forth, needed to be counteracted by the truths which supplement and rectify these one-sided errors. (3) It was of importance to Job, not so much to instruct the friends in regard to the *fact* that the impending destruction of the ungodly was certain—for that they had long known this fact is expressly set forth in ver. 12—as rather to place this phenomenon in the right light, in opposition to the perverted application which they had made of it, and to exhibit its profound connection with the order of the universe as established by the only wise God. This end he accomplishes by subsequently introducing a

description of true wisdom and understanding, a treasure deeply hidden, and to be possessed only through the fear of God, and humble submission to Him.—This is the end which Job has in view in the present discourse. It is not necessary (with Brentius and others of the older expositors, also Schlottmann) to find in it a *warning* purpose, *i. e.*, the purpose to set before the friends the end of those who judge unjustly, and who render unfriendly decisions, with a view of terrifying them—a purpose of which there is nowhere any indication, and for which there would seem to be no particular motive, seeing that the discussion has come to an end, and that any attempt to move the vanquished opponents by warnings would be cruelly and most injuriously at variance with the conciliatory mildness which this last discourse of Job's elsewhere breathes.

[*a.* The attempts to relieve the difficulty connected with the passage before us by changing and transposing the text are arbitrary and unsatisfactory, producing abrupt connections, or rather breaks, and a confusion of thought and impression more serious than that which it is sought to remove.

b. Especially does it betray a total want of appreciation of the author's skill in managing the plot and development of the drama to force in Zophar for a third speech. The logical and rhetorical exhaustion of the friends could not well be more effectively indicated than by the way in which the colloquy on their part tapers and dwindles—first in the short, and so far as ideas are concerned, poverty-stricken speech of Bildad, and finally in the complete dumbness of Zophar, perhaps of all three the most consummate master of words.

c. The theory that Job is here going over the ground of the friends, and repeating their position, is disproved negatively by the absence of anything to indicate such a course, and positively by the straightforward earnestness and deep feeling which pervade the passage, as well as by what he says in the introductory verses 11, 12.

d. Regarded as Job's own earnest affirmations the following considerations should be borne in mind.

(1) As shown above by Zöckler, isolated statements have already proceeded in harmony with the representation given here. At the same time it cannot be denied that this is much the most extended and emphatic expression by Job of the view here set forth, and that it is in form much more nearly allied to the representations of the friends. But:

(2) It is no part of the poet's plan to preserve Job's unalterable consistency. Job's experiences are most various, and his utterances change with them. They strike each various chord of sorrow, joy, doubt, confidence, despair, hope, fear, yearning, victory. Through all it is true there is an underlying unity and identity of character; but the variations exist, and are full of dramatic interest and importance, and yet more of sacred practical suggestiveness.

(3) These inconsistencies still further prepare the way for a termination and solution of the controversy. As Umbreit has shown, "without the apparent contradiction in Job's speeches, the interchange of words would have been endless;" or as Delitzsch has stated it: "Had Job's stand-point been absolutely immovable, the controversy could not possibly have come to a well-adjusted decision, which the poet must have planned, and which he also really brings about, by causing his hero still to retain an imperturbable consciousness of his innocence, but also allowing his irritation to subside, and his extreme harshness to become moderated."

(4) In the particular passage before us, Job's utterance is to be explained largely in the light of the victory which he has just achieved. In the hour of triumph a great soul is moderate, calm, just. So here Job shows the greatness of his strength by conceding to the friends the truth in their position, and by stating that truth with a power equal to their own. It is a masterly touch of the poet's art that shows itself here in this picture of a great soul in the hour of victory.

(5) There is, however, as suggested above by Zöckler, a still more conscious and controlling purpose in the following description. Job describes the certain destruction of the wicked, not mainly in the way of concession to the friends, but rather *for his own vindication.* The friends had portrayed such descriptions to show how much there are in the evil-doer's fate to remind of Job's calamities. Job takes up the theme to show how *unlike* his fate, with all its tragic lineaments, and the abandoned sinner's. *He* still holds fast to his righteousness, is heard by God, delights in God, is on terms of intimacy with God, is competent to instruct in behalf of God;—the wicked man has a very different portion with God! As ever therefore Job is not merely eloquent, but cogent; and when he accepts their conclusions, it is to overwhelm them yet more completely with their own arguments.—E.]

First Strophes: vers. 11-13. Introduction to the following description.

Ver. 11. **I will teach you concerning God's hand:** *i. e.* concerning His doings, His mode of working. In regard to בְּ with verbs of teaching or instructing, comp. Ps. xxv. 8, 12; xxxii. 8; Prov. iv. 11 (Ew. § 217, *f*).—**The mind of the Almighty will I not conceal from you:** lit. "what is *with* the Almighty, that which forms the contents of His thoughts and counsels;" comp. ch. x 13; xxiii. 10, *etc.*

Ver. 12. **See now, all ye yourselves** [אַתֶּם emphatic] **have seen it,** have become familiar with it by observation (חָזָה, as in ch. xv. 17), so that ye do not need to learn the thing itself, but only to acquire a more correct, unprejudiced understanding of it. The second member points to the latter: "and why are ye then vain with vanity?" *i. e.* so altogether vain, so completely entangled in perverse delusion? (Ew. § 281, *a*).

Ver. 13 announces the theme treated of in the passage following, in words which purposely convey a reminder of the language used by one of the opponents, Zophar, at the close of his discourse (ch. xx. 29).

Second Strophe: vers. 14–18. The judgment,

upon the family, possessions, and homestead of the evil-doer.

Ver. 14. **If his children multiply** (it is) **for the sword.** יִרְבּוּ sc. לְמוֹ־חָרֶב. In respect to לְמוֹ, found only in Job, comp. ch. xxix. 21; xxxviii. 40; xl. 4 (Ew. § 221, *b*).

Ver. 15. **The remnant of those who are his shall be buried by the pestilence.**—שְׂרִידָיו "his escaped ones" (comp. chap. xx. 21. 26), are the descendants still remaining to him, after that the sword and famine have already thinned their ranks. This remainder the *Pestilence* will carry off, that third destroying angel, in addition to the sword and famine, mentioned also in Jer. xiv. 12; xv. 2; xviii. 21; 2 Sam. xxiv. 13; Lev. xxvi. 25 seq. Here, as also in Jer. xv. 2, this is simply designated "death" (מָוֶת); and by the phrase, "in death (or by death) they are buried," allusion is made to the quick succession of death and burial, which is customary in such epidemics (comp. Amos vi. 9 seq.). This bold and truly poetic thought is destroyed if, with Böttcher, we take בַּמּוֹת to mean *in momento mortis*, or if, with Olshausen [Merx], we arbitrarily insert a לֹא before יִקָּבֵרוּ. [Carey explains: "*They shall be sepulchred by Death.* This is literal, and a bold figure, by which is signified that they should have no other burial than such as Death should give them on the open field, where they had fallen, either by sword or by famine." This, however, is somewhat too artificial and modern]. **And his widows weep not**—to wit, in following the coffin, because by reason of the frightful raging of the disease, funeral solemnities are not observed. "*His* widows" may mean both the principal wives and concubines of the head of the family, and those of his deceased sons and grandsons; these latter even, in a certain sense, belonging to him, the patriarch. Comp. the literal repetition of this member in Ps. lxxviii. 64, where the twofold possibility mentioned here is not recognized, because the אַלְמְנֹתָיו there refers to the "people," עָם.

Ver. 16. **If he heapeth up for himself silver as the dust,** *etc.*—The same figures used to designate material regarded as worthless on account of its great quantity in Zech. ix. 3.

Ver. 17. Apodosis to the preceding verse, expressing the same thought as, *e.g.*, Ps. xxxvii. 29, 34; Eccles. ii. 16.

Ver. 18. **He hath built, like a moth, his house, and like a booth, which a watchman puts up** (in a vineyard, or an orchard, Isa. i. 8). The point of comparison for both members is the laxity, frailty, destructibility of such structures, which are intended to be broken up soon.

Third Strophe: Vers. 19–23. **He lieth down rich, and doeth it not again.**—So according to the reading וְלֹא יֹאסִף (=יוֹסִיף), which already the LXX. (*καὶ οὐ προσθήσει*), Itala, and Pesh. followed, which is favored by parallel passages, such as chap. xx. 9; xl. 5, and is accordingly preferred by the leading modern commentators, such as Ewald, Hirzel, Delitzsch, Dillmann [Renan, Rodwell, Merx]. The renderings based on the reading וְלֹא יֵאָסֵף are not so good; as, *e.g.*, "and yet nothing is taken away" (Schnurr., Umbreit, Stick. [Elzas, Wemyss: "but he shall take nothing away"];—"and he is not buried" (Ralbag, Rosenmüller, Schlottmann) [Noyes, E. V.: "he shall not be gathered," and so Con., Lee, Scott, *etc.* Carey explains the familiar phrase, "to be gathered (to one's fathers, *etc.*)." not of being buried in the grave, but of being removed to the place of spirits. The objections to referring the clause to the rich man's burial, as stated by Delitzsch, are, that the preceding strophe has already referred to his not being buried, and that the relation of the two parts of the verse in this interpretation is unsatisfactory]. The same may be said of the reading וְלֹא יֶאֱסֹף, "and takes not with him" (Jerome, and some MSS.). **Openeth his eyes—and is gone!** (comp. chap. xxiv. 24).—This further description of the sudden end of the wicked relates to the morning, the time of awakening, as the preceding clause refers to the evening hour of going to bed.

Ver. 20. **The multitude of terrors** (*i. e.*, the sudden terrors of death; comp. chap. xviii. 14; xx. 25) **like the waters** (like the torrents of a sudden overflow—comp. chap. xx. 28; Jer. xlvii. 2; Ps. xviii. 5 [4]) **overtakes him** (תַּשִּׂיגֵהוּ, 3d Perf. sing. fem. referring to the plur. בַּלָּהוֹת; comp. chap. xiv. 19). On *b* comp. chap. xxi. 18.

Ver. 21. Further descriptive expansion of the figure of a tempest: **The east wind lifteth him up.**—This wind being elsewhere frequently described as particularly violent and descriptive; comp. chap. i. 19; xv. 2; xxxviii. 24; Isa. xxvii. 8; Ezek. xxvii. 26. Concerning וְיֵלַךְ, *ut pereat*, comp. chap. xiv. 20; xix. 10.

Ver. 22. The subj. of וְיַשְׁלֵךְ can be only *God*, the secret Author of the whole judgment of wrath here described. Of Him it is said: **He hurleth upon him without sparing**—to wit, arrows; comp. chap. xvi. 13; and in regard to the objectless הִשְׁלִיךְ="to shoot," see Num. xxxv. 20. **Before His hand must he flee**—lit. "must he fleeing flee."—The Inf. Absol. expresses the strenuousness and yet the futility of his various attempts to flee (Del.: "before His hand he fleeth hither and thither").

Ver. 23. **They clap their hands at him**—rejoicing at his calamity and mocking him; comp. chap. xxxiv. 37; Lam. ii. 15; Nah. iii. 19. The plural suffixes in עָלֵימוֹ and כַּפֵּימוֹ are used poetically for the sing., as in chap. xx. 23; xxii. 2. "The accumulation of the terminations *êmo* and *ômo* gives a tone of thunder and a gloomy impress to this conclusion of the description of judgment, as these terminations frequently occur in the book of Psalms, where moral depravity is mourned and divine judgment threatened (*e.g.*, in Psalms xvii.; xlix.; lviii.; lix.; lxxiii)." Del. **They hiss him out of his place**—so that he must leave his dwelling-place (comp. chap. viii. 18) in the midst of scorn and hissing

(comp. Zeph. ii. 15; Jer. xlix. 17). Or "out of his home" (Hirz.), which rendering gives essentially the same meaning.

4. *Third Section: First Strophe.* Chap. xxviii. 1–11. The difficulty, indeed the absolute impossibility, of attaining true wisdom by human skill and endeavor, described by means of an illustration taken from *mining*, which gives man access to all valuable treasures of a material sort, but which can by no means put him in possession of that spiritual good which comes from God. The question—*whence the author had acquired so accurate a knowledge of mining as he here displays, seeing that the land of the Israelites was comparatively poor in mineral treasures* (comp. Keil, *Bibl. Archäol.*, p. 35 seq., 38)? may be answered, on the basis of Biblical and extra-Biblical sources of information, as follows: (1) The Jews in Palestine could not have been absolutely strangers to the business of mining, seeing that in Deut. viii. 9 there is expressly promised to them "a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass." (2) Both Lebanon in the north, and the Idumean mountains in the south-east of Palestine proper, had *copper* mines, the particular location of these being at Phunon, or Phaino, Num. xxxiii. 42 seq., in the working of which it is certain that the Jews were occasionally interested; comp. Volney's *Travels;* Ritter, *Erdkunde* XVII. 1063; Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1095; v. Rougemont, *Bronzezeit*, p. 87. (3) The Israelites possessed *iron* pits, *possibly* in South Lebanon, where in modern times such may still be found, together with smelting furnaces (Russegger, *Reise* I. 779, 778 seq.), but certainly in the country east of the Jordan, where, according to the testimony of Josephus, *de B. Jud.* IV. 8, 2, there was an "iron mountain" (σιδηροῦν ὄρος) north of Moabitis, the "Cross Mountain," *El Mi'râd* of to-day, between the gorges of the *Wadi Zerka* and *Wadi Arabun*, west of *Gerash;* a mountain district in which in our own century iron mines have been worked here and there (v. Rougemont, *l. c.;* Wetzstein in Delitzsch, II. 90–91). (4) Jerome testifies to the existence of ancient *gold* mines in Idumea (*Opp.* ed. Vall. III. 183). (5) The Israelites might also come occasionally into connection with the copper and iron mines of the Sinai-peninsula, in the development of which the Egyptian Pharaohs were conspicuously energetic (comp. Aristeas v. Haverkamp, p. 114; Lepsius, *Briefe*, p. 335 seq.; Ritter, *Erdkunde* XIV. 784 seq ; v. Rougemont, *l. c.** (6) What has been said above by no means excludes the possibility that in this description the poet in many particulars took for his basis traditional reports concerning the mines of distant lands, *e. g.* concerning the gold mines of Upper Egypt and Nubia (Diodorus iii. 11 seq.), concerning the gold and silver mines of the Phenicians in Spain (1 Macc. viii. 3; Plin. iii. 4; Diod. v. 35 seq.), concerning the emerald quarries of the Egyptians at Berenice, and other deposits of precious stones, more or less remote. Comp. above Introd. § 7, *b;* and see a fuller discussion of the subject in Delitzsch ii. 86-89; to some extent also the mining experts who have commented on the following verses, such as v. Weltheim (in J. D. Mich., *Orient. Bibl.* 23, 7 seq.), and Rud. Nasse (*Stud. u. Krit.*. 1863, p. 105 seq.)

* The name *Mafkat*, "Land of Copper," which the Egyptians gave to the Sinaitic peninsula on account of those mines, is of late explained by Brugsch to mean "Land of Turquois." it being assumed by him that turquois was the principal product of the ancient Egyptian mines in that region. Comp. H. Brugsch, *Wanderung nach den Türkisminen der Sinai—Halbinsel*, 1868, 2d Ed., p. 66 seq.

Ver. 1. **For there is for the silver a vein** [Germ. *Fundort*, place where it is found], **and a place for the gold, which they refine.**—The connection between this section and the preceding, which is indicated by the causal כִּי "for," is this: The phenomenon described in ch. xxvii. 11-23, that the wicked—with whom, according to vers. 2-10 Job is *not* to be classed—meet with a terrible end without deliverance, is to be explained by the fact that they do not possess true wisdom, which can be acquired only through the fear of God, which cannot, like the treasures of this earth (the only object for which the wicked plan and toil), be dug out, exchanged or bought. The proposition introduced by כִּי accordingly assigns a reason first of all for that which forms the contents of ch. xxvii. 11–23 ("the prosperity of the ungodly cannot endure"), but secondarily and indirectly also that which is announced in ch. xxvii. 2-10 (Job is an upright man, and one who fears God, whose joy in God does not forsake him even in the midst of the deepest misery). ["The miserable end of the ungodly is confirmed by this, that the wisdom of man, which he has despised, consists in the fear of God; and Job thereby attains at the same time the special aim of his teaching, which is announced at ch. xxvii. 11 by אורה אתכם ביד־אל; *viz.* he has at the same time proved that he who retains the fear of God in the midst of his sufferings, though those sufferings are an insoluble mystery, cannot be a רשע. . . . . And if we ponder the fact that Job has depicted the ungodly as a covetous rich man who is snatched away by sudden death from his immense possession of silver and other costly treasures, we see that ch. xxviii. confirms the preceding picture of punitive judgment in the following manner: silver and other precious metals come out of the earth, but wisdom, whose value exceeds all these earthly treasures, is to be found nowhere within the province of the creature; God alone possesses it, and from God alone it comes; and so far as man can and is to attain to it, it consists in the fear of the Lord and the forsaking of evil." Delitzsch.] The first verses of the chapter indeed down to the 11th, present nothing whatever as yet of that which serves directly to establish those antecedent propositions, they simply prepare the way for the demonstration proper, by describing the achievements of art and labor in the accumulation by men of their treasures, by means of which nevertheless wisdom can *not* be found. Hence כִּי may appropriately be rendered "for truly" (the "but" in ver. 12 corresponding to the "truly"). This connection between ch. xxviii. and xxvii. is erroneously exhibited, when any subordinate proposition of ch. xxvii. is regarded as that which is to be established (as *e. g.*, according to Hirzel, the question in ver.

12: "why are ye so altogether vain? why do ye adhere to so perverse a delusion?" or according to Schlottmann the purpose to warn against the sin of making unfriendly charges, which he thinks is to be read between the lines in the description vers. 11-23). These false conceptions of the connection, alike with the total abandonment of all connection, which has led many critics to resort to arbitrary attempts to assign to ch. xxviii. another position (*e. g.* according to Pareau after ch. xxvi.; according to Stuhlmann after ch. xxv.) or to question altogether its genuineness (Knobel, Bernstein—comp. Introd. § 9, 1)—all these one-sided conceptions rest, for the most part, on the assumption that it is the *divine* wisdom, which rules the universe, whose unsearchableness is described in our chapter, and not rather wisdom regarded as a *human* possession, as a moral and intellectual blessing bestowed by God on men, connected with genuine fear of God. Comp. Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks, No. 1. [E. V.'s rendering of כִּי by "surely" overlooks the connection, and was probably prompted by the difficulty attending it].—מוֹצָא, lit. "outlet" (comp. 1 Kings x. 28), the place where anything may be found, synonymous with the following מָקוֹם.—The word יָזֹקּוּ is a relative clause: gold, which they refine, or wash out. In regard to זקק, lit. "to filter, to strain," as a technical term for purifying the precious metals from the stone-alloy which is mixed with them, comp. Mal. iii. 3; Ps. xii. 7 [6]; 1 Chron. xxviii. 18. Comp. the passage relative to the gold mines of Upper Egypt, describing this process of crushing fine the gold-quartz, and of washing it out, this process accordingly of "gold-washing," as practised by the ancients, in Diodor. iii. 11 seq., as well as the explanations in Klemm's *Allgem. Kulturgesch.* V. 503 seq., and in M. Uhlemann, *Egypt. Alterthumskunde*, II. 148 seq.

Ver. 2. **Iron is brought up out of the ground.**—עָפָר here of the *interior* or *deep* ground, not of the surface as in ch. xxxix. 14; xli. 25 [33], **and stone is smelted into copper.**—יָצוּק here not as in ch. xli. 15 Partic. Pual of יצק, but as in ch. xxix. 6 Imperf. of יצק=צוק (the 3d pers. sing. masc. expressing the indefinite subj.). [Gesenius not so well makes the verb transitive: "and stone pours out brass."]

Ver. 3. **He has put an end** [שָׂם still the indefinite subj., but as the description becomes more individual and concrete, it is better with E. V. to use from this point on the personal pron. "he"] **to the darkness**, viz. by the miner's lamp; **and in every direction** (lit. "to each remotest point, to every extremity, in all directions") [not as E. V. "all perfection," which is too general, missing the idiomatic use of the phrase; nor adverbially: "to the utmost," or "most closely:"—"לתכלית might be used thus adverbially, but לכל-תכלית is to be explained according to לכל-רוח, Ezek. v. 10, 'to all the winds.'" Delitzsch]—**he searcheth the stones of darkness and of death-shade**, *i. e.* the stones under the earth, hidden in deep darkness. הוּא before חוֹקֵר refers back to the indefinite subj. of שָׂם, who is continued through ver. 4, and again in vers. 9-11.

Ver. 4. **He breaketh** [openeth, cutteth through] **a shaft away from those who sojourn** (above). נחל, elsewhere river, valley [river-bed] (*Wadi*), is here—as is already made probable by the verb פָּרַץ, pointing to a violent breaking through (comp. ch. xvi. 14), and as is made still more apparent by the third member of the verse—a mining passage in the earth, and that moreover a perpendicular shaft rather than a sloping gallery. מֵעִם-גָּר, lit. "away from one tarrying, a dweller," *i. e.* removed from the human habitations found above, removing from them ever further and deeper into the bowels of the earth. [Schlottmann understands by גר the miner himself dwelling as a stranger in his loneliness; *i. e.* his shaft sinks ever further from the hut in which he dwells above. The use of גר is doubtless a little singular, and Schlottmann's explanation may be accepted so far as it may serve to account for it by the suggestion that those who do live in the vicinity of mines are naturally גֵּרִים, sojourners, living there to ply their trade and shifting about as new mines or veins are discovered.—E.]—**Who are forgotten of every step**, lit. "of a foot" (מִנִּי-רָגֶל), *i. e.* of the foot or step of one travelling above on the surface of the earth [hence="totally vanished from the remembrance of those who pass by above"], not the foot of the man himself that is spoken of, as though his descent by a rope in the depths of the shaft were here described (V. Leonhardt in Umbr. and Hirzel). [On this use of מִן after נשכח, comp. Deut. xxxi. 21; Ps. xxxi. 13; "forgotten out of the mind, out of the heart"]. Moreover הַנִּשְׁכָּחִים are identical, according to the accents, with the indef. subj. of פָּרַץ (the interchange between sing. and plur. acc. to Ew. § 319, *a*); hence the meaning is: those who work deep down in the shafts of the mines. They are again referred to in the finite verbs in *c*, which continue the participial construction: **they hang far away from men, and swing.** דַּלּוּ from דלל (related to זלל) *deorsum pendere*, according to the accents, accompanies מֵאֱנוֹשׁ (meaning the same with מֵעִם-גָּר), not נָעוּ, as Hahn and Schlottm. think. The adventurous swinging of those engaged in digging the ore out of the steep sides of the shafts, hanging down by a rope, is in these few, simple words beautifully and clearly portrayed. It is the situation described by Pliny (H. N. xxxiii. 4, 21: *is qui cædit, funibus pendet, ut procul intuenti species ne ferarum quidem, sed alitum fiat. Pendentes majori ex parte librant et lineas itineri prædacunt, etc.* [The above rendering, adopted by all modern exegetes, gives a meaning so appropriate to the language and connection, and withal so beautiful, vivid and graphic that it seems strange that all the ancient and most of the

modern versions of Scripture, including E V., should have so completely darkened the meaning. The source of the difficulty lay doubtless in נחל which being taken in its customary meaning of "river, flood," threw everything into confusion. Add to this a probable want of familiarity with mining operations on the part of the early translators, and the result will not seem so surprising.—E.]

Ver. 5 states what the miners are doing in the depths.—**The earth—out of it cometh forth the bread-corn** (לֶחֶם as in Ps. civ. 14), **but under it it is overturned like fire**: *i. e.* as fire incessantly destroys, and turns what is uppermost lowermost. ["Man's restless search, which rummages everything through, is compared to the unrestrainable ravaging fire." Del.] Instead of כְּמוֹ Jerome reads בּוֹ: "is overturned *with* fire," which some moderns prefer (Hirz., Schlott.), who find a reference here to the blasting of the miners. But this is too remote. ["The principal thought is the process of breaking through; the means are not so much regarded; and fire was not the only means." Dillmann. Some commentators have fancied in this verse a trace of what modern criticism calls "sentimentalism," as though Job were protesting against ruthlessly ravaging as with fire the interior of that generous earth which on its surface yields bread for the support of man. Job is, however, fixing his attention solely on the agent—man, who not satisfied with what grows *out of* the earth, digs for treasure into its deepest recesses.—E.]

Ver. 6. **The place of the sapphire** (מָקוֹם as in ver. 1 *a*, the place where it may be found) **are its stones,** *viz.* the earth's, ver. 5; in the midst of its stones is found the sapphire, which is mentioned here as a specimen of precious stones of the highest value.—**And nuggets of gold** (or "gold ore," hardly "gold-dust" as Hirzel thinks) **become his,** *viz.* the miner's (so Schult., Rosenm., Ewald, Dillmann). Or: "nuggets of gold belong to it," the place (מקום) where the sapphire is found (Hahn, Schlottm., Delitzsch). The reader may take his choice between these two relations of לוֹ; the brevity of the expression makes it impossible to decide with certainty.

Ver. 7. **The path** (thither) **no bird of prey hath known [and the vulture's eye hath not gazed upon it].** נָתִיב is a prefixed nom. absol. like אֶרֶץ in ver. 5. It may indeed also be taken as in opposition to מָקוֹם in ver. 6 (hardly to עַפְרֹת זָהָב, as Ewald thinks), in which case the rendering would be: "the path, which no bird of prey hath known," *etc.* (Del.). But that "the place of the sapphire" should be immediately afterwards spoken of as a "path," looks somewhat doubtful. Concerning שְׁזָפַתּוּ comp. on ch. xx. 9.—[The rendering of E. V.: "There is a path which no fowl knoweth," *etc.*, is vague and incorrect in so far as it leads the mind away from the deposits of treasure, which are the principal theme of the passage.—E.]

Ver. 8 carries out yet further the description begun in ver. 7 of the inaccessibleness of the subterranean passage-ways. **The proud beasts of prey** (lit. "sons of pride;" so also in ch. xli. 26 [34]) **have not trodden it.**—That this finely illustrative phrase ["sons of pride"] refers to the haughty, majestically stepping beasts of prey ["seeking the most secret retreat, and shunning no danger," Del.], appears clearly enough from the parallel use of שַׁחַל in *b* (comp. ch. iv. 10).

Ver. 9. **On the flint** (the hardest of all stones) **he lays his hand** (the subject being man, as the overturner of mountains; see *b*, and respecting the use there of מִשֹּׁרֶשׁ, *radicitus*, "from the root," comp. above ch. xiii. 27; xix. 28. ["שָׁלַח יָד בְּ something like our "to take in hand," of an undertaking requiring strong determination and courage, which here consists in blasting, *etc.* Del.] How the hand is laid on flint and similar hard stones is described by Pliny *l. c.: Occursant silices; hos igne et aceto rumpunt. sæpius vero, quoniam id cuniculos fumo et vapore strangulat, cædunt fractariis CL. libras habentibus, etc.*

Ver. 10. **Through the rocks he cutteth passages.**—יְאֹרִים, an Egyptian word, which signifies literally water-canals, must here, like נחל in ver. 4, signify subterranean passages or pits for mining. And further, according to *b*, what is intended are galleries, horizontal excavations, in which the ore is dug out, and precious stones discovered. The word can scarcely be used of wet conduits, or canals to carry off the water accumulating in the pits, of which Job does not begin to speak until the following verse (against v. Weltheim, *etc.*). [The rendering "rivers" (E V., Con., Car., Rod., *etc.*) would be still more misleading, because more vague, than "canals," which is not without plausible arguments in its favor. Add however to Zöckler's arguments in favor of the rendering "passages, galleries," the sequence in the second member: **And his eye sees every precious thing**; which, as Delitzsch says, "is consistently connected with what precedes, since by cutting these *cuniculi* the courses of the ore (veins), and any precious stones that may also be embedded there, are laid bare."—E.]

Ver. 11. **That they may not drip he stops up passage-ways.**—מִבְּכִי, lit. "away from dripping" [weeping], or: "against the dripping," *i. e.* against the oozing through of the water in the excavations, to which the shafts and galleries, especially when old, were so easily liable. חִבֵּשׁ, as elsewhere חָבַשׁ, to stop or dam up, to bind up surgically (comp. חֹבֵשׁ, the surgeon, or wound-healer in Is. iii. 7; i. 6). נְהָרוֹת seems in general to mean the same as נחלים above, and יְאֹרִים ver. 10, to wit, excavations, shafts, pits, galleries. Nevertheless it may also denote "the seams of water" breaking through the walls of these excavations, thus directly denoting that which must be stopped up (Del.).—**And so** (through all these efforts and skilful contrivances) **he brings to the**

light that which was hidden—a remark in the way of recapitulation, connecting back with the beginning of the description in ver. 1, and at the same time forming the transition to what follows. Respecting תַּעֲלֻמָה, comp. ch. xi. 6; אוֹר, *Acc. loci* for לָאוֹר.

5. *Continuation: Second Strophe:* vers. 12–22. Application of the preceding description to wisdom as a higher good, unattainable by the outward seeking and searching of men. ["Most expositors since Schultens, as *e. g.* Hirz., Schlott., *etc*, assume out of hand that *the Wisdom* treated of here is the divine wisdom, as the principle which maintains the moral and natural order of the universe. But that the divine wisdom is to be found only with God, not with a creature, is something so very self-evident, and the exaltation of the divine wisdom above all human comprehension was a proposition so universally recognized, being also long since maintained and conceded by both the contending parties of our book (chs. xi. and xii.), that it is not apparent why Job should here lay such stress upon it." Dillm.]

Ver. 12. **But wisdom—where is it found? And where** (lit. "from where?" מֵאַיִן as in ch. i. 7, and מִן accompanying מָצָא as in Hos. xiv. 9 [8]) **is the place of understanding?** הַחָכְמָה, with the article, because wisdom is to be set forth as the well-known highest good of man. With the principal term חָכְמָה is connected בִּינָה as an alternate notion, as is often the case in Proverbs, especially chs. i.–ix. The first term denotes wisdom rather on its practical side, as the principle and art of right thinking and doing, or as the religious and moral rectitude taught by God; the second (with which תְּבוּנָה, Prov. viii. 1, and דַּעַת, Prov. i. 2, alternate) pre-eminently on the theoretic side as the correct perception and way of thinking which lies at the basis of that right doing. Comp. the Introd. to the Solomonic Literature of Wisdom, § 2, Note 3 (Vol. X., p. 7 of this series).

Ver. 13. **No mortal knows its price.**—עֶרְכָּהּ (from ערך vers. 17, 19) means lit. equivalent, price, value for purchase or exchange, the same with מְחִיר elsewhere. The LXX. probably read דַּרְכָּהּ, which reading is preferred by some moderns, *e. g.*, by Dillmann, as agreeing better with ver. 12

Ver. 14. With "the land of the living" [ver. 13] *i. e.*, the earth inhabited by men (comp. Ps. xxvii. 13; Is. xxxviii. 11, *etc.*) are connected the two other regions beneath heaven, in which wisdom might possibly be sought: (1) The "Deep" (תְּהוֹם) *i. e.*, the subterranean abyss with its waters, out of which the visible waters on the surface of the earth are supplied (Gen. vii. 11; xlix. 25):—(2) The "Sea" (יָם = Ὠκεανός) as the chief reservoir of these visible waters.

Ver. 15. **Pure gold is not given for it.**—סְגוֹר is the same with זָהָב סָגוּר, 1 Kings vi. 20; x. 21, not "shut up" [= carefully preserved], but according to the Targ. "purified" gold (*aurum colatum, purgatum*), hence gold acquired by heating, or smelting; comp. Diodor. *l. c.*

Ver. 16. In regard to the gold of Ophir (here כֶּתֶם אוֹפִיר, fine gold of Ophir) comp. ch. xxii. 24; respecting the onyx stone (שֹׁהַם, lit. "pale, lean") comp. the commentators on Gen. ii. 12.

Vers. 17–19. Further description of the incomparable and unattainable value of wisdom, standing in a similar connection with vers. 15, 16, as Prov. iii. 15 with Prov. iii. 14.—**Gold and glass are not equal to it.**—ערך intrans. with Accus.—*æquare aliquid*, as in ver 19; Ps. lxxxix. 7. In respect to the high valuation of glass by the ancients (זְכוּכִית, or as some MSS., Ed's., and D. Kimchi read—זְכוֹכִית) comp. Winer, *Realw.*, Vol. I., 432 [and Eng. Bib. Dictionaries, Art "Glass"]. In respect to תְּמוּרָה in *b*, "exchange, equivalent," comp. ch. xv. 31; xx. 18.

Ver. 18. **Corals and crystal are not to be named,** not to be mentioned, *i. e.*, *in comparison* with it, with wisdom (in regard to the construction of the passive יִזָּכֵר with the accus., comp. Gesen., § 143 [§ 140] 1, *a*). גָּבִישׁ, (lit. "ice," like the Arab. *gibs*) denotes the quartz-crystal, which was regarded by the ancients as a precious stone, and supposed to be a product of the cold; Pliny, *H. N.* XXXVII. 2, 9.—The רָאמוֹת, the mention of which precedes, seem to be "corals," an explanation favored by what is conjectured to be the radical signification of this word, "horns of bulls, or of wild oxen" (from רְאֵם—comp. Pliny XIII. 51), as well as by its being placed along with the less costly crystal; comp. also Ezek. xxvii. 16, where indeed corals from the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean are mentioned as Tyrian articles of commerce. On the contrary פְּנִינִים in *b* must be, according to Prov. iii. 15; viii. 11; xx. 15; xxxi. 10, an exchangeable commodity of extraordinary value, which decides in favor of the signification "*pearls*" assigned (although not unanimously) to this word by tradition, however true it may be that in Lam. iv. 7 corals seem rather to be intended (or perhaps red pearls artificially prepared, like the Turkish rose-pearls of to-day). Comp. Carey [who agrees in rendering רָאמוֹת by "corals," and doubtfully suggests "mother-of-pearl" for גָּבִישׁ]. Delitzsch renders the former of the two words by "pearls," the second by "corals" [so J. D. Michaelis. Rödiger, Gesenius, Fürst; the two latter regarding ראמות and פנינים as equivalent. See also in Smith's Bib. Dic.,—Art's., "Rubies," "Pearls," "Coral"]. The word מֶשֶׁךְ, "acquisition, possession," (from משך, "to draw to oneself") only here in the O T.; related are מֶשֶׁק, Gen. xv. 2, and מִמְשָׁק, Zeph. ii 9.

Ver. 19. **The topaz from Ethiopia** (Cush) **is not equal to it.**—The rendering topaz (τοπάζιον) for פִּטְדָה is established by the testimony of most of the ancient versions in this passage, as well as in Ex. xxviii. 17; Ezek. xxviii 13. It is also favored by the statement of Pliny (xxxvii. 8) that the topaz comes principally from the islands of the Red Sea, as also by the probable identity of the name פטדה with the San-

scrit *pita*, yellow (comp. Gesen.) [and see the Lexicons, Delitzsch, Carey, *etc* , on the probable transposition of letters in the Hebrew and Greek forms]. In regard to *b*, comp. the very similar passage in ver 16 *a*).

Ver. 20 again takes up the principal question propounded in ver. 12. The וְ in וְהַחָכְמָה is consecutive, and may be rendered by "then" (Ew., § 348, *a*).

Ver. 21. **It is hidden** (וְנֶעֶלְמָה, lit., "and moreover, and further it is hidden") **from the eyes of all living**, *i. e.*, especially of all living beings on the earth; כָּל־חָי as in ch. xii. 10; xxx. 33. Of these "living" *b* then particularly specifies the sharp-sighted, winged inhabitants of the upper regions of the air; comp. above ver. 7.

Ver. 22 follows up the mention of that which is highest with that of the lowest: **Hell and the abyss** [lit. "destruction and death"] **say**, מָוֶת in connection with אֲבַדּוֹן (see on ch. xxvi. 6) means the *realm* of death, the abyss; comp. ch. xxxviii. 17; Ps. ix. 14 [13]; Rev. i. 18. For the rest comp. above, ver. 14; for to say that they [destruction and death] have learned of wisdom only by hearsay is substantially the same with saying, as is said there of the sea and the deep, that they do not possess it. ["The נעלמה מעיני כל חי, ver. 21, evidently points back to the כל יקר ראתה עינו ver. 10. In ver. 11 it is said that man brings the most secret thing to light. In ver. 22 that Divine wisdom is hidden even from the underworld." Schlott.].

6. *Conclusion: Third Strophe:* Vers. 22–28 The final answer to the question, where and how wisdom is to be found: to wit, only with God, and through the fear of God. ["The last of these three divisions (of the chap.) into which the highest truths are compressed is for emphasis the shortest, in its calmness and abrupt ending the most solemn, because the thought finds no expression that is altogether adequate, floating in a height that is immeasurable, but opening a boundless field for further reflection." Ewald.]

Ver. 23. **God knows the way to it, and He knows its place.**—אֱלֹהִים and הוּא, in emphatic contrast with the creatures mentioned in ver. 13 seq., and ver. 21 seq. The suffix in דַּרְכָּהּ is objective (comp. Gen. iii. 24) "the way to it."

Vers. 24, 25 constitute one proposition which illustrates and explains the Divine possession of wisdom by a reference to God's agency in creating and governing the world (so correctly Ewald, Arnh., Dillm.) [E. V., Conant, Rodman]. Against connecting ver. 25 with what follows, more immediately with ver. 26, and then regarding vers. 25, 26 together as constituting the protasis of ver. 27 lies the objection that לַעֲשׂוֹת cannot properly be translated either "*when* He made," or "in that He made," as well as the fact that the gerundive Infinitive with לְ cannot be put before its principal verb, together with the absence of a suffix after לַעֲשׂוֹת referring to the subject God [should be לַעֲשׂוֹתוֹ if the verse were antecedent]. Furthermore the Divine "looking to the ends of the earth," *etc.*, ver. 24, would need a telic qualification, referring the divine omniscience [God's looking every where and seeing every thing] to the creation and preservation of the order of nature, in order that it might not be understood as declaring the omniscience of God *in abstracto*. **That He may appoint to the wind its weight, and weigh the water by measure.**—The careful "measurement" of wind and water, *i. e.*, their relative apportionment, government, and management (comp. Isa. lx. 12), is a peculiarly characteristic example of God's wise administrative economy in creation: "Who sends the wind upon its course," *etc.* Instead of the Infinitive the finite verb appears in *b*, and that in the Perf. form, תִּכֵּן, because the expression of purpose passes over into the expression of sequence, precisely as in chap. v. 21 (see on the v.).

Ver. 26 seq. As the wisdom of God furnishes the means and basis of His government of the world, so in the exercise of His creative power was it the absolute norm, and is in consequence thereof the highest law for man's moral action, positively and negatively considered. **When He appointed for the rain a law** (when and how often it should fall, where it should cease; comp. Gen. ii. 5) **and for the thunder-flash a path** (*i. e.*, through the clouds; comp chap. xxxviii. 25), **then saw He it and declared it**—*i. e.*, in thus exercising at the beginning His creative power, *He beheld it, contemplated it* (we are to read רָאָהּ with Mappiq in ה), as His eternal pattern, according to which He made, ordered, and ruled His creatures, *and declared it* (וַיְסַפְּרָהּ, lit. "and enumerated it"), *i. e.*, unfolded its contents before men and His other rational creatures throughout the whole creation, which in truth is nothing else than such a "development and historical realization" of the contents of eternal wisdom. The attempt of Schult.. Ew., Dillm. to explain ספר as meaning "to number through, to review all over" (after ch. xxxviii. 37; Ps. cxxxix. 18) is less natural.—**He established it, and also searched it out**, *i. e.*, He laid its foundations in the creation (comp. Prov. viii. 22, 23, where both verbs. קנה and נסך, convey the same idea of founding, establishing wisdom as הֵכִין here), brought it to its complete actualization in creation, and then reviewed all its individual parts to see whether they all bore the test of His examination. Comp. what is said in Gen. i. 31: "And God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good" —Or again: "*He set it up before Himself*," for more attentive contemplation (הֵכִין according as in chap. xxix. 7), and searched it out thoroughly, exploring its thoughts (so Wolff and Dillmann) [the latter of whom says: "He set it up for contemplation, as an artist or an architect puts up before himself the תַּבְנִית"]. It is not necessary, with some MSS. and Eds. to read הֱבִינָהּ, instead of הֱכִינָהּ, as Döderl. and Ew. do.

Ver. 28. **And said to man: Behold, the fear of the Lord is wisdom,** *etc.*—He would

accordingly not reserve to Himself the wisdom which had served Him as a pattern of creation, but would communicate it to the human race which He had made and put into His world, which He could do only by setting it before them in the form of an original command to fear God and to depart from evil (סוּר מֵרָע, comp. ch. i. 2; Prov. iii. 7; xvi. 6. Instead of יִרְאַת אֲדֹנָי, very many MSS. and old editions read יִרְאַת יְהוָֹה, which reading seems to have in its favor: (1) That יְהוָֹה, occurring only twice elsewhere in our book, might easily be set aside as being too singular; (2) that אֲדֹנָי in Jehovah's own mouth does not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament, not even in Amos vi. 8; (3) that the parallels of the primitive saying before us in the Proverbs and in the Psalms constantly exhibit יִרְאַת יְהוָֹה (comp. Prov. i. 7; iii. 7; ix. 10; xvi. 6; Ps. cxi. 10).—On the other side it is true the Masoretic tradition expressly reckons this passage among the one hundred and thirty-four passages of the Old Testament, where אדני is not only to be read, but is actually written instead of יהוה (Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, p. 245). As regards the thought, it makes no difference whether we read "fear of the Lord" ("the Lord of all," Del.), or "fear of Jehovah (Jahveh)." [It may, however, be said, that there is an especial appropriateness in the use of אדני here, in view of the fact that God is spoken of in connection with the creation, as the product of wisdom; and not only so, but God in His *Lordship*, His supremacy, His claim to be feared, *i. e.* revered and obeyed, whence אדני is used rather than אלוה or אלהים. God is אדני by virtue of the divine חכמה which He has "established" in nature. It is man's חכמה to recognize the divine, and to fear אדני.—E.]

DOCTRINAL, ETHICAL AND HOMILETICAL.

1. According to the connection of the Third Section of this discourse with the two preceding, as explained in the remarks on ch. xxviii. 1, it can admit of no doubt that the wisdom described in it is conceived of as essentially a *human* acquisition, as a blessing bestowed on man by God, consisting in the fear of God and in righteousness of life. This connection lies indeed in this —that in order to prove that which is said in ch. xxvii. 12 seq. of the perishable prosperity of worldly-minded sinners, the uselessness of all accumulation of earthly treasures is shown, it being entirely out of their power to secure the possession of true wisdom, and of that enduring prosperity which is connected with it. In addition to this connection with ch. xxvii., the human character of this wisdom, rather than its hypostatic character, or that which belongs to it as a divine attribute, is shown secondly by the way in which the same is represented in vers. 15-19 as a possession, being compared with other possessions, treasures and costly jewels, and the question submitted how its possession (מֶשֶׁךְ, ver. 18) is to be attained. To which may be added, thirdly, the consideration that it could scarcely be the speaker's purpose to demonstrate the unsearchableness and unfathomableness, from a sensuous and earthly point of view, of an attribute, or a hypostasis of God, because this fact is self-evident, and because the whole tendency of his discourse was not theoretic and speculative, but practical, aiming at the establishment of right principles to influence human struggle and action.—The view accordingly held by quite a number of modern exegetes since the time of Schultens (especially Hirzel, Schlottmann, Hahn, also W. Wolff's article—*Die Anfänge der Logoslehre im A. T.* in the *Zeitschrift für Luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1870. p. 217 seq.), that the object of the description in ch. xxviii. is the wisdom of God as exercised in the universe, as the divine principle sustaining the moral and natural order of the universe, is erroneous, to say nothing of the fact that in that case one might find here, with A. Merx (*Das Gedicht von Hiob, etc.*, p. 42) a "concealed polemic" against the doctrine of Wisdom as set forth in the Solomonic Proverbs.

2. We cannot say indeed of this theory, to wit, that ch. xxviii. discourses of the *Sapientia sciagraphica*, God's wisdom in creation and the government of the world—that it is altogether incorrect. In the concluding verses Job evidently lifts himself from his contemplation of wisdom as a human possession to the description of its archetype, the absolute divine wisdom, by means of which God has established alike the physical and the moral order of the universe. The passage in vers. 23-28 comes into the closest contact with the two well-known descriptions of the Book of Proverbs which are occupied with this eternal world-regulating wisdom—Prov. iii. 19-26, and Prov. viii. 22 seq. It resembles them particularly in the fact that a preliminary meditation on the human reflection and emanation of this primordial wisdom, on the practical Chokmah of the God-fearing, righteous man, prepares the way for it, precisely as in those two passages. The "knowledge of the place" of the Creative Wisdom, which ver. 23 ascribes to God, reminds the reader of Prov. viii. 30, in like manner as that which is said of its mediating agency in determining the laws of wind, water, rain and thunder (vers. 24-26) reminds him of Prov. iii. 19 seq.; viii. 27 seq. And what is said of "seeing and declaring," "establishing," or "setting up and searching out" the heavenly architectress in ver. 27, precisely as in Prov. viii. 22 seq., presents Wisdom as the infinitely many-sided pattern of the κτίσις κόσμου, as the ideal world, or the divine imagination of all things that were to be created, as the complex unity of all the creative ideas or archetypes present to God from eternity. This divine creative primordial wisdom, as described here, and in the two parallel passages in the Solomonic writings (and not less in those passages of the Apocrypha which in some respects are still more full, *viz.* Sirach, ch. xxiv., and Wisdom, ch. vii. –ix), is without question closely related to the idea of the Logos given in the New Testament. It is very true that the idea of Wisdom, especially in the passage before us, the oldest of all pertaining to the subject, has not yet shaped itself into a form of existence so concretely personal, and a filial relation to God so intimate

and so indicative of similarity of nature, as characterize the Johannean Logos. It appears rather simply as an "impersonal model" for God in His creative activity, while the New Testament Logos is the "personal architect" working in accordance with that model, "the demiurg by which God has called the world into existence according to that ideal which was in the divine mind" (Del.). But notwithstanding this its undeveloped character, the Chokmah of our passage is the unmistakable *substratum* and the immediate precursor of the revealed perception of a personal Word, and of an only-begotten Son of God. And as the older exegesis and theology was already in general correct in referring our passage to the Divine in Christ (the σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ, Matt. xi. 19; Luke xi. 49) the attempts of more recent writers to deny any genetic connection of ideas between it and the New Testament doctrine of the Logos, and in general to regard human wisdom as the only object described, even in vers. 23-28 (*e. g.* Bruch, *Weisheitslehre, etc.*, p. 202; V. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I: 95 seq.; Luthardt, *Apologetische Vorträge über die Heilswahrheiten des Christenth.*, 2d Ed. p. 227), have rightly evoked much opposition. Comp. Philippi, *Kirchl. Glaubenslehre* II. 192 seq.; Kahnis, *Luth. Dogm.* I, 316 seq.; III, 209 seq.; Bucher, *Des Johannes Lehre vom Logos*, 1856; also B. Couve, *Les Origines de la Doctrine du Verbe*, Toulouse, 1869, p. 36 seq. The latter indeed denies in respect to the present passage (in which, like Hofmann, he is inclined to find merely a poetic personification of *human* wisdom) that it is related in the way of preparation to the New Testament doctrine of the Logos, but admits this in respect to the parallel passages in Proverbs, and the later passages. Against Merx's view, which in part is similar, see above No. 1, near the end.

3. Taken in connection with the preparatory train of thought in ch. xxvii. this description of wisdom, or more strictly, of the way to true wisdom, forms one of the most important, artistically elaborated portions of the whole poem. It is a suitable conclusion to the first principal division of the poem, or the entanglement which results from the controversial passage between Job and his friends, taking the form of a *Confession of Faith*, in which Job, after victoriously repelling all the assaults of his enemies, states his position on all the chief points, about which the controversy had revolved, in a manner full at once of a calm dignity and the consciousness of victory. The one favorite proposition of his opponents,—that his suffering could not be undeserved—he solemnly and unqualifiedly repels by again asseverating his complete innocence (ch. xxvii. 2-10). In asserting here that his conscience does not hold up before him *one* of his former days as worthy of blame or punishment (ver. 6) he transgresses in a one-sided manner the bounds of that which could be maintained with strict truth concerning himself (comp. ch. xxvi. 13), and so causes that foul spot to appear clearly enough on his moral conduct and consciousness, for which he must needs implore forgiveness. On the other hand, the confession which follows of his belief in that other favorite proposition of his opponents—that the wicked are punished in this life (ch. xxvii. 11-23)—seems to go too far in an opposite direction; for after what he has said repeatedly heretofore in favor of the teachings of experience touching the temporal prosperity of the ungodly, he could not properly concede the point which he now maintains, and that so completely without qualification. The first half of his discourse accordingly seems liable to the charge of being egregiously one-sided and of departing from strict actual truth in two respects —in declaring that Job's suffering was wholly, and in every respect unmerited, and in admitting that even in this life there is a divine judgment awaiting the wicked, from which they cannot escape. The second principal division of the discourse prepares the way at least for supplementing and correcting both of these one-sided representations through its elevated eulogy on true wisdom, founded on constant undivided surrender to God, however much there may be still that needs purifying and improving. He dwells with special emphasis on the fact that the eager striving and longing of the wicked reaches not only after earthly treasures and jewels, such as are to be procured out of the depths of the earth only with much toil and effort. He thus intimates that their whole prosperity, being founded on such earthly treasures (comp. ch. xxvii. 16), is in itself perishable, unreal, a mere phantom, and emphasizes all the more strongly in contrast with it the incomparable worth of a prosperity consisting in the fear of God and in strict rectitude, in surrendering oneself wholly to that which is divine, in the pursuit of heavenly treasures, in a word in true wisdom, the image and emanation of the eternal divine wisdom of the Creator, a prosperity of so high an order that he would possess it as the foundation, and at the same time as the fruit of his innocence, and that it would not forsake him even now, in the midst of his fearful sufferings and conflicts. There is much in this train of thought that is not brought out with such clearness as might be desirable. Some of it must even be read between the lines as being tacitly taken for granted, particularly that which refers to Job as having formerly possessed and as still possessing this heavenly practical wisdom, and also to its relation to his temporary misery. But although the discourse may lack that close consecutiveness and thorough completeness of plan which modern philosophic poets or thinkers might have impressed upon it, it nevertheless forms a truly suitable conclusion to the preceding controversies, and at the same time a striking transition to the gradual solution of the whole conflict which now follows. As regards its significance in the structure of the poem it may be termed "*Job's Eulogy on Wisdom*," in which he announces his supreme axiom of life, and characteristically gives to his vindication against the friends its harmonious peroration, and its seal. It appears in the structure of the book as "the clasp which unites the half of the δέσις with the half of the λύσις," and on which the poet has characteristically inscribed the well-known axiom of the Old Testament Chokmah—"The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom" (Delitzsch).

4. For the *homiletic* treatment of this section it is more important to call attention to the close family relationship existing between this eulogy of Job's on wisdom and such New Testament passages as Paul's eulogy on Love (1 Cor. xiii.), our Lord's admonition in the Sermon on the Mount to seek treasures in heaven (Matt. vi. 19 seq), the similar exhortations of Paul and James (1 Tim. vi.; James v.), than to take pains to exhibit the plan of the section, lacking as it is in complete thoroughness, and to show its subtle, oftentimes completely hidden connections with the previous course of the colloquy. A large number of hearers would scarcely be prepared to follow with profit such elaborate disquisitions concerning the niceties of plan in the discourse, and by reason of the not inconsiderable expenditure of time requisite for such an object, they would be quite, or almost quite untouched by so much beauty and impressive power as the details of the discourse present. A division of the whole into smaller sections, at least into the three, which constitute the natural partition of the discourse, seems here also to be required for homiletic purposes, in order that every part of it may be suitably appreciated and unfolded.

Particular Passages.

Chap. xxvii. 2 sq. V. Gerlach: If by God's grace a holy man then (under the Old Dispensation) kept his life pure, and observed God's commandments, albeit in weakness, to which the speeches of Job himself bear witness (this very confession especially), it was of the highest importance that this his life should not be judged falsely, that he should be recognized as God's visible representative, as a revealer of His law, as a support of God's servants such as were weaker, not free from blame. Such a prince among God's saints on earth as Job lived pre-eminently for God's people, and he could not, without throwing all into confusion, deny his position, could not through false humility surrender his righteousness, which for very many was the righteousness of God himself; he must on occasion declare boldly that his enemies were also enemies of God. Hence his showing himself on the spot in this confession as a victor after the struggle was not only a comfort to the sorely tried man, but also of importance for the complete establishment of that which he affirmed.

Ch. xxvii. 10. Brentius: When he says that the hypocrite does not always call upon God, he has reference to the duty of praying without ceasing (1 Thess. v. 17). For where there is faith, prayer is never suspended, although one should be asleep, or should be doing something else. Unbelief indeed never prays, except with the mouth only; but such praying cannot reach through the clouds.

Ch. xxvii. 13 seq. Osiander: God does not forget the wickedness of the ungodly, but punishes it in His own time most severely, and generally even in this life (Ex. xxxii. 34). . . . The destruction of the ungodly is therefore to be waited for in patience. Although these think that when misfortune befalls them, it comes by chance, it does nevertheless come from God because of their sin (Am. iii. 6).

Ch. xxviii. 1 seq. Zeyss: If men are so ingenious, and so indefatigably industrious in discovering and obtaining earthly treasures, how much more should they toil to secure heavenly treasures, which alone can give true rest to our souls, make us rich and happy (Matt. xvi. 26)! —Brentius: All else in the nature of things, however deeply hidden, can be searched out and valued by human labor and industry; the wisdom of God alone can neither be sought out, nor judged by human endeavor. Although the veins of silver and gold lie hidden in the most secret recesses of the mountains, they are nevertheless discovered by great labor, and riches, which incite to so many evils, are dug out. In like manner iron, however it may be hidden in the most secret depths of the earth, can nevertheless be discovered; but no one anywhere has found the wisdom of God by human endeavor.

Ch. xxviii. 12 seq. Oecolampadius: Corporeal substances, of whatsoever kind, can be found somewhere. Wisdom is of another order of being: you can ascertain neither its place nor its price. In vain will you journey to the Brahmins, to Athens, to Jerusalem; although you cross the sea, or descend into the abyss, you but change your skies, not your soul. Neither schools, nor courts, nor temples, nor monasteries, nor stars, will make one wiser.

Ch. xxviii. 23-28. Oecolampadius (on ver. 27): Not that we should think of God so childishly, as though in His works He had need of deliberation or of an external pattern, but in His nature He has such productiveness that He both wills and produces at one and the same time (Ps. xxxiii. 9).—Cocceius: Distinguish between the wisdom which is the pattern and the end, and that which is the shadow [image], and the means. The former is with God, is God, and is known only to God; the latter is from God in us, a ray of that Wisdom. In like manner, we are said to be κοινωνοὶ θείας φύσεως (2 Pet. i. 4), *i. e.* through having God's image, being one with Him, and enjoying Him.—Jac. Boehme (according to Hamberger, *Lehre J. Böhme's*, p. 55): Wisdom is a divine imagination, in which the ideas of the angels and souls and all things were seen from eternity, not as already actual creatures, but as a man beholds himself in a mirror.—W. Wolff (*Die Anfänge der Logoslehre, etc. Zeitschrift f. Luth. Theol.*, 1870, p. 220): What is wisdom? It is not measuring space with the help of mathematics, it is not contemplating cells through the microscope, it is not even resolving things into their original substance, and determining their relations one to another, but it is having an insight into their nature, having full knowledge of their original condition. Yea, more; absolute wisdom is *essentially creative.* We can search out indeed God's thoughts (in His creation), but we cannot gather up any truth into a vital point, out of which anything can proceed or originate; we cannot (to use the language of J. Böhme) "compress it into a centre." . . . God alone has that creative wisdom. He must know it, for He has it first and foremost *in Himself.* It is not discovered and searched out by Him, but it is in His

being (Prov. viii. 25 seq.) It was, and is, in the same eternal form in which God is: uncreated, divinely internal.—V. GERLACH (on ver. 28): "He who would learn the secrets of the mighty must keep watch diligently at their gates," says with truth an eastern proverb. Without the living moral followship of the heart with God it is vain to desire to know wisdom, which comes only from Him, and belongs only to Him.

SECOND CHIEF DIVISION OF THE POEM.

DISENTANGLEMENT OF THE MYSTERY THROUGH THE DISCOURSES OF JOB, ELIHU AND JEHOVAH.

CHAPTERS XXIX—XLII. 6.

First Stage of the Disentanglement.

CHAPS. XXIX—XXXI.

Job's Soliloquy, setting forth the truth that his suffering was not due to his moral conduct, that it must have therefore a deeper cause. [The negative side of the solution of the problem.]

1. Yearning retrospect at the fair prosperity of his former life.

CHAPTER XXIX.

a. Describing the outward appearance of this former prosperity.

VERS. 1–10.

1 Moreover, Job continued his parable, and said:

2 O that I were as in months past,
as in the days when God preserved me;
3 when His candle shined upon my head,
and when by His light I walked through darkness;
4 as I was in the days of my youth.
when the secret of God was upon my tabernacle;
5 when the Almighty was yet with me,
when my children were about me;
6 when I washed my steps with butter,
and the rock poured me out rivers of oil;
7 when I went out to the gate through the city,
when I prepared my seat in the street!
8 The young men saw me, and hid themselves;
and the aged arose, and stood up.
9 The princes refrained talking,
and laid their hand on their mouth.
10 The nobles held their peace,
and their tongue cleaved to the roof of their mouth.

b. Pointing out the inward cause of this prosperity—his benevolence and integrity.

VERS. 11-17.

11 When the ear heard me, then it blessed me;
and when the eye saw me, it gave witness to me:
12 because I delivered the poor that cried;
and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him.

13 The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me:
and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy.
14 I put on righteousness, and it clothed me:
my judgment was as a robe and a diadem.
15 I was eyes to the blind,
and feet was I to the lame.
16 I was a father to the poor;
and the cause which I knew not I searched out.
17 And I brake the jaws of the wicked,
and plucked the spoil out of his teeth.

c. Describing that feature of his former prosperity which he now most painfully misses, viz., **the universal** *honor shown to him, and his far-reaching influence: vers.* 18 25.

18 Then I said, I shall die in my nest,
and I shall multiply my days as the sand.
19 My root was spread out by the waters,
and the dew lay all night upon my branch.
20 My glory was fresh in me,
and my bow was renewed in my hand.
21 Unto me men gave ear, and waited,
and kept silence at my counsel.
22 After my words they spake not again;
and my speech dropped upon them.
23 And they waited for me as for the rain;
and they opened their mouth wide as for the latter rain.
24 If I laughed on them, they believed it not;
and the light of my countenance they cast not down.
25 I chose out their way, and sat chief,
and dwelt as a king in the army,
as one that comforteth the mourners.

2. Sorrowful description of his present sad estate.

CHAPTER XXX.

a. The ignominy and contempt he receives from men: vers. 1–15.

1 But now they that are younger than I have me in derision,
whose fathers I would have disdained
to have set with the dogs of my flock.
2 Yea, whereto might the strength of their hands profit me,
in whom old age was perished?
3 For want and famine they were solitary;
fleeing into the wilderness
in former time desolate and waste.
4 Who cut up mallows by the bushes,
and juniper roots for their meat.
5 They were driven forth from among men,
(they cried after them as after a thief);
6 To dwell in the cliffs of the valleys,
in caves of the earth, and in the rocks.
7 Among the bushes they brayed;
under the nettles they were gathered together.
8 They were children of fools, yea, children of base men;
they were viler than the earth.

9 And now am I their song,
yea, I am their byword.
10 They abhor me, they flee far from me,
and spare not to spit in my face.

11 Because He hath loosed my cord, and afflicted me,
they have also let loose the bridle before me.
12 Upon my right hand rise the youth;
they push away my feet,
and they raise up against me the ways of their destruction.
13 They mar my path,
they set forward my calamity,
they have no helper.
14 They came upon me as a wide breaking in of waters;
in the desolation they rolled themselves upon me.
15 Terrors are turned upon me:
they pursue my soul as the wind:
and my welfare passeth away as a cloud.

b. The unspeakable misery which everywhere oppresses him: vers. 16-23.

16 And now my soul is poured out upon me;
the days of affliction have taken hold upon me.
17 My bones are pierced in me in the night season;
and my sinews take no rest.
18 By the great force of my disease is my garment changed:
it bindeth me about as the collar of my coat.
19 He hath cast me into the mire,
and I am become like dust and ashes.
20 I cry unto Thee, and Thou dost not hear me:
I stand up, and Thou regardest me not.
21 Thou art become cruel to me;
with Thy strong hand Thou opposest Thyself against me.
22 Thou liftest me up to the wind;
Thou causest me to ride upon it,
and dissolvest my substance.
23 For I know that Thou wilt bring me to death,
and to the house appointed for all living.

c. The disappointment of all his hopes: vers. 24-31.

24 Howbeit he will not stretch out his hand to the grave,
though they cry in his destruction.
25 Did not I weep for him that was in trouble?
was not my soul grieved for the poor?
26 When I looked for good, then evil came unto me;
and when I waited for light, there came darkness.
27 My bowels boiled, and rested not:
the days of affliction prevented me.
28 I went mourning without the sun:
I stood up, and I cried in the congregation.
29 I am a brother to dragons,
and a companion to owls.
30 My skin is black upon me,
and my bones are burned with heat.
31 My harp also is turned to mourning,
and my organ into the voice of them that weep.

3. Solemn asseveration of his innocence in respect to all open and secret sins.

CHAPTER XXXI.

a. He has abandoned himself to no wicked lust: vers. 1-8.

1 I made a covenant with mine eyes;
why then should I think upon a maid?
2 For what portion of God is there from above?
and what inheritance of the Almighty from on high?

3 Is not destruction to the wicked?
and a strange punishment to the workers of iniquity?
4 Doth not He see my ways,
and count all my steps?
5 If I have walked with vanity,
or if my foot hath hasted to deceit;
6 let me be weighed in an even balance,
that God may know mine integrity.
7 If my step hath turned out of the way,
and mine heart walked after mine eyes,
and if any blot hath cleaved to mine hands;
8 then let me sow, and let another eat;
yea, let my offspring be rooted out.

b. He has acted uprightly in all his domestic life: **vers. 9-13.**

9 If mine heart have been deceived by a woman,
or if I have laid wait at my neighbor's door;
10 then let my wife grind unto another,
and let others bow down upon her.
11 For this is a heinous crime;
yea, it is an iniquity to be punished by the judges.
12 For it is a fire that consumeth to destruction,
and would root out all mine increase.
13 If I did despise the cause of my man-servant, or of my maid-servant,
when they contended with me;
14 what then shall I do when God riseth up?
and when He visiteth, what shall I answer Him?
15 Did not He that made me in the womb make him?
and did not One fashion us in the womb?

c. He has constantly practised neighborly kindness and justice in civil life: **vers. 16-23.**

16 If I have withheld the poor from their desire,
or have caused the eyes of the widow to fail;
17 or have eaten my morsel myself alone,
and the fatherless hath not eaten thereof:
18 (for from my youth he was brought up with me, as with a father,
and I have guided her from my mother's womb;)
19 if I have seen any perish for want of clothing,
or any poor without covering;
20 if his loins have not blessed me,
and if he were not warmed with the fleece of my sheep;
21 if I have lifted up my hand against the fatherless,
when I saw my help in the gate;
22 then let mine arm fall from my shoulder blade,
and mine arm be broken from the bone!
23 For destruction from God was a terror to me,
and by reason of His highness I could not endure.

d. He has not violated his more secret obligations to God and his neighbor: **vers. 24-32.**

24 If I have made gold my hope,
or have said to the fine gold, Thou art my confidence;
25 if I rejoiced because my wealth was great,
and because mine hand had gotten much;
26 if I beheld the sun when it shined,
or the moon walking in brightness;
27 and my heart hath been secretly enticed,
or my mouth hath kissed my hand:

28 this also were an iniquity to be punished by the judge;
for I should have denied the God that is above.
29 If I rejoiced at the destruction of him that hated me,
or lifted up myself when evil found him:
30 (—neither have I suffered my mouth to sin
by wishing a curse to his soul:)
31 if the men of my tabernacle said not,
O that we had of his flesh! we cannot be satisfied.
32 The stranger did not lodge in the street:
but I opened my doors to the traveller.

e. He has been guilty furthermore of no hypocrisy, or mere semblance of holiness, of no secret violence, or avaricious oppression of his neighbor: vers. 33-40.

33 If I covered my transgressions as Adam,
by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom:
34 did I fear a great multitude,
or did the contempt of families terrify me,
that I kept silence, and went not out of the door?
35 O that one would hear me!
behold, my desire is that the Almighty would answer me,
and that mine adversary had written a book.
36 Surely I would take it upon my shoulder,
and bind it as a crown to me.
37 I would declare unto Him the number of my steps;
as a prince would I go near unto Him.
38 If my land cry against me,
or that the furrows likewise thereof complain;
39 If I have eaten the fruits thereof without money,
or have caused the owners thereof to lose their life;
40 Let thistles grow instead of wheat,
and cockle instead of barley.

The words of Job are ended.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Although introduced by the same formula as the discourse immediately preceding (comp. ch. xxix. 1 with xxvii. 1), this last long series of Job's utterances exhibits decidedly a *μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος*, a form and method esssentially new in comparison with the former controversial and argumentative discourses of the colloquy. They are not once addressed to the friends, who since ch. xxv. have been entirely silenced, and have not been provoked to further reply even by the elaborate instructions, which he imparts to them in ch. xxvii. xxviii. Instead of this they frequently appeal to *God*, and present, especially in the last section, a long series of solemn asseverations or adjurations uttered before God. They thus appear, in contrast with the interlocutory character of the discourses hitherto, as a genuine *soliloquy* by Job, which both by its contents and by its conspicuous length, forms a suitable transition to the following discourses, or groups of discourses by Elihu and Jehovah, which are in like manner of considerable length. The three principal sections are a yearning retrospect to the happy *past* (ch. xxix.), a description of the sorrowful *present* (ch. xxx.), and solemn asseverations of innocence in presence of the divine judge, or God of the *Future* (ch. xxxi.). These divisions are very obvious, and justify the divisions into chapters founded on them as corresponding strictly to that intended by the poet himself. Neither can there be much doubt in regard to the more special sub-division of these chief divisions. The first and the second contain respectively three long sub-divisions or strophes, of 8-9 verses each (once only, ch. xxx. 1 seq. of 15 verses, which long strophe indeed may also be divided into two shorter ones of 8 and 7 verses. In the third part there appear quite distinctly five groups of thought of 7-8 (once of 9) verses each.

2. *First Division: The prosperity of the past:* ch. xxix. ["It is very thoughtfully planned by the poet that Job, by this description of his former prosperity, unintentionally refutes the accusations of his friends, inasmuch as it furnishes a picture of his former life very different from that which they had ventured to assume. We have here the picture of a rich and highly distinguished chief of a tribe [or patriarch], who was happy only in spreading abroad happiness and blessing." Schlottmann].

First Strophe: vers. 2-10: The outward appearance of this former prosperity.

Ver. 2. **Oh that it were to me** [Oh that I were] **as in months of yore!** lit. "who gives (makes) me like the months of the past," who

puts me back in the happy condition of that time (so Rosenm., Welte, Vaih, *etc.*). Or, with the dative rendering of the suffix in יִתְּנֵנִי (as in Is. xxvii. 4; Jer. ix. 1), "who gives *to me* like the months of the past," *i. e.* who makes me to live over such! (so usually). On the construction in *b* (the constr. state כִּימֵי before the relative clause), comp. Gesenius, § 116, [§ 114], 3. [Green, § 255, 2].

Ver. 3. **When it** (viz.) **His lamp shone above my head.**—בְּהִלּוֹ, Inf. Kal of הלל with the vowel *a* weakened to *i* (Ewald, § 255, *a*) [Green, § 139, 2], not Inf. Hiph. as Böttcher would render it, when after the Targ. he translates: "when He caused His lamp to shine." This Hiphil rendering could only be justified if (with Ewald in his comm.) we should read בְּהָלּוֹ (בְּהַהִלּוֹ). ["Probably alluding to the custom of suspending lamps in rooms or tents over the head. The language of this ver. is of course figurative, and implies prosperity and the divine favor." Carey]. On the anticipation of the subject נֵרוֹ by the suffix, comp. Ew., § 309, *c*. Delitzsch quite too artificially refers the suffix in בהלו to God, and takes נֵרוֹ as a self-corrective, explanatory permutative: "when He, His lamp shone, *etc.*"

Ver. 4. **As I was in the days of my harvest.**—כַּאֲשֶׁר, "as, according as," resumes the simple כְּ in כירחי and כימי, ver. 2. "The days of the harvest" are, as ver. 5 *b* shows, a figurative expression for ripe manhood ["the days of my prime" Carey], *the ætas virilis suis fructibus fœta et exuberans* (Schultens): comp. Ovid *Metam.* XV. 200. [The rendering of E. V. "in the days of my youth" (after Symmach. and the Vulg.) is less correct, as is shown by the reference above to ver. 5 *b*, the time referred to being that when he had his children about him, as well as by the word חרף itself, which means the time when the ripe fruit is gathered]. **When Eloah's friendship was over my tent**; *i. e.* dispensed protection and blessing above my habitation. סוֹד here meaning "familiarity, confidential intercourse," (as in ch. xix. 19; Ps. xxv. 14; lv. 15 [14]; Prov. iii. 22), not the celestial council of God, as in ch. xv. 8 (against Hirzel). ["בְּסוֹד either by ellipsis for בהיות סוד or סוֹד having the force of an active [verbal] noun, "His being familiar." Dillm.—Carey's explanation, though pushing the literal rendering a little too far, is striking: "lit. *in the seat or cushion of God being at my tent; i. e.*, when God was on such terms of familiar intercourse with me that he had, as it were, his accustomed seat at my tent"].

Ver. 5. On children as a most highly valued blessing, placed here next to God Himself, comp. Ps. cxxvii. 3 seq.; cxxviii. 3. Concerning נערים in this sense (not in that of "servants,") see above ch. i. 19; xxiv. 5.

Ver. 6. **When my steps were bathed in cream** (comp. ch. xx. 17, where however we have the full form חֶמְאָה), **and the rock beside me poured out streams of oil**; that which elsewhere was barren poured out costly blessings, and that close by his side, so that he was not compelled to go far; comp. Deut. xxxii. 13.

Vers. 7-10. The honor and dignity which he then enjoyed. **When I went forth to the gate up to the city.** שַׁעַר is equivalent to שַׁעְרָה, towards the gate (comp. ch. xxviii. 11; Gen. xxvii. 3), not: "out at the gate" (as below, ch. xxxi. 34 פֶּתַח), for Job's residence was in the country, not in the city with שערים. For this same reason he speaks here of his going up עֲלֵי קָרֶת, "up to the city;" for the city adjoining to him, was on an eminence, as was usually the case with ancient cities. [Comp. Abraham's relations to Hebron, as indicated in Gen. xxiii.]. In respect to the use of the space directly inside the gates of these cities as a place for assemblies of the people, comp. above, ch. v. 4; also xxxi. 4; Prov. i. 21; viii. 3, and often. **When I prepared my seat in the market.** רְחוֹב the open space at the gate, as in Neh. viii. 1, 3, 16, *etc.* On the construction (the change from the Infin. to the finite verb), comp. ver. 3; ch. xxviii. 25.

Ver. 8. **Then the young men saw me, and hid themselves**; *i. e.* as soon as they came in sight of me, from reverential awe. **And the gray-headed rose up, remained standing**—until I myself had sat. ["A most elegant description, and exhibits most correctly the great reverence and respect which was paid, even by the old and decrepit, to the holy man in passing along the streets, or when he sat in public. They not only rose, which in men so old and infirm was a great mark of distinction, but they stood, they continued to do it, though the attempt was so difficult." Lowth]. On the construction, comp. Ewald, § 285, *b*.

Ver. 9. **Princes restrained themselves from speaking** (עָצַר בְּמִלִּים, as in ch. iv. 2; xii. 15), **and laid the hand on their mouth,** imposed on themselves reverential silence; comp. ch. xxi. 5. ["What is meant is not that those who were in the act of speaking stopped at Job's entrance, but that when he wished to speak, even princes, *i. e.* rulers of great bodies of men, or those occupying the highest offices, refrained from speech." Dillmann].

Ver. 10. **The voice of nobles hid itself,** lit. "hid themselves," for the verb נֶחְבָּאוּ is put in agreement with the plur. dependent on קוֹל as the principal term, as in the similar cases in ch. xv. 20; xxi. 21; xxii. 12. [Comp. Green, § 277].—נְגִידִים lit. "those who are visible" (from נגד) *i. e.* conspicuous, noble [*nobiles*]. On *b* comp. passages like Ps. cxxxvii. 6; Ezekiel iii. 26.

Continuation. Second Strophe: vers. 11-17. Job's active benevolence and strict integrity as the inward cause of his former prosperity.

Ver. 11. **For if an ear heard—it called me happy**—lit. "for an ear heard, and then called me happy;" and similarly in the second member. The object of the hearing, as afterwards of the seeing, is neither Job's speeches in the assembly of the people ["if this ver. were a continuation of the description of the proceed-

ings in the assembly, it would not be introduced by 'כִּי" Dillm.], nor his prosperity (Hahn, Delitzsch), but as ver. 12 seq. shows, his whole public and private activity. [For the reason mentioned by Dillmann 'כִּי is better translated "for" than "when" (E. V.)]. In regard to אִשֵּׁר "to pronounce happy," comp. Prov. xxxi. 28; Cant. vi. 9. In regard to הֵעִיד, to bear favorable testimony to any one, comp. μαρτυρεῖν τινι Luke iv. 22; Acts xv. 8.

Ver. 12. **For I delivered the poor, that cried, and the orphan, who had no helper** (וְלֹא־עֹזֵר לוֹ) a circumstantial clause, comp. Ew., § 331). [The clause "is either a third new object (so E. V.)], or a close definition of what precedes: the orphan and (in this state of orphanhood) helpless one. The latter is more probable both here and in the Salomonic primary passage Ps. lxxii. 12; in the other case ואשר אין־עזר לו might be expected." Delitz.]. The Imperfects describing that which is wont to be, as also in vers. 13, 16. As to the sentiment, comp. Ps. lxxii. 12.

Ver. 13. **The blessing of the lost** (lit. "of one lost, perishing;" אֹבֵד as in ch. xxxi. 19; Prov. xxxi. 6) **came upon me**; *i. e.*, as *b* shows, the grateful wish that he might be blessed from such miserable ones as had been rescued by him, hardly the actual blessing which God bestowed on him in answer to the prayer of such (comp. Hermas, *Past. Simil.* 2).

Ver. 14. **I had clothed myself with righteousness, and it with me**; *i. e.*, in proportion as I exerted myself to exercise righteousness (צֶדֶק) toward my neighbor, the same [righteousness] took form, filled me inwardly in truth ["it put me on as a garment, *i. e.*, it made me so its own, that my whole appearance was the representation of itself, as in Judg. vi. 34, and twice in the Chron., of the Spirit of Jehovah it is said that He puts on any one, *induit*, when He makes any one the organ of His own manifestation," Delitzsch. "Righteousness was as a robe to me, and I was as a robe to it. I put it on, and it put me on; it identified itself with me." Words.] Not: "and it clothed me," as Rosenmüller, Arnh., Umbr. [E. V., Schlottm., Carey, Renan, Rod., Elz., *etc.*], arbitrarily render the second לָבַשׁ, thereby producing only a flat tautology. [Ewald also: "it adorned me."—The other rendering is adopted, or approved by Gesen., Fürst, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Wordsworth, Noyes in his Notes]. The figure of *being clothed* with a moral quality or way of living to represent one as equipped, or adorned therewith, (comp. Isa. xi. 5; li. 9; lix. 17; Ps. cxxxii. 9), is continued in the second member, where Job's strict righteousness and spotless integrity (this is what מִשְׁפָּט means; comp. Mic. iii. 8) are represented as "a mantle and a tiara (turban);" comp. Is. lxi. 10.

Ver. 15. Comp. Num. x. 31. To be anybody's eye, ear, foot (here "feet"), *etc.*, is of course to supply these organs by the loving ministration of help, and to make it possible as it were to dispense with them.

Ver. 16. On *a* comp. Is. ix. 5; xxii. 21.—אָב and אֶבְיוֹנִים seem to form a paronomasia here. —**And the cause of the unknown** [the strangers, the friendless] **I searched out**, *i. e.*, in order to help them as their advocate, provided they were in the right.—לֹא־יָדַעְתִּי, attributive clause, as in ch. xviii. 21; Is. xli. 3; lv. 5, and often. [E. V., "the cause which I knew not" is admissible, and gives essentially the same sense; but the other rendering is to be preferred, as furnishing a better parallel to the "blind, lame, poor," preceding.—The man whom nobody knew, or cared for, Job would willingly take for his client.—E.].

Ver. 17. **I broke the teeth of the wicked** (the cohortative, וָאֲשַׁבְּרָה, as in ch. i. 15; xix. 20), **and out of his teeth I plucked the prey.**—For the description of hardhearted oppressors and tyrants (or unrighteous judges, of whom we are to think particularly here), under the figure of ravaging wild beasts, from which the prey is rescued, comp. Ps. iii. 8 [7]; lviii. 7 [6], *etc.*

4. *Conclusion: Third Strophe:* Vers. 18–25. The honor and the influence which Job once enjoyed, and the loss of which he mourns with especial sorrow.

Ver. 18. **And so then I thought [said]: With my nest** ["together with my nest," as implying a wish that he and his nest might perish together, would be "unnatural, and diametrically opposed to the character of an Arab, who in the presence of death cherishes the twofold wish that he may continue to live in his children, and that he may die in the midst of his family," Delitzsch] (or also: "in my nest") **shall I die**; *i. e.*, without having left or lost my home, together with my family, and property (comp. Ps. lxxxiv. 4 [3]), hence in an advanced, happy old age.—**And like the phenix have many days**: lit., "make many, multiply my days." The language also would admit of our rendering חוֹל "sand," understanding the expression to refer to the multiplication of days like grains of sand; comp. "as the sand of the sea" in 1 Ki. v. 9 [iv. 29 applying to Solomon's wisdom] and often; also Ovid, *Metam.* XIV. 136 seq.: *quot haberet corpora pulvis, tot mihi natales contingere vana rogavi.* But against this interpretation, which is adopted by the Targ., Pesh., Saad., Luther, Umbreit, Gesenius, Stickel, Vaih., Hahn, [E. V., Con., Noy., Ber., Carey, Words., Renan, Rodwell, Merx], and in favor of understanding חוֹל of the phenix, that long-lived bird of the well-known oriental legend (so most moderns since Rosenmüller) may be urged: (1) The oldest exegetical tradition in the Talmud, in the Midrashim, among the Masoretes and Rabbis (especially Kimchi); (2) the versions—manifestly proceeding out of a misconception of this phenix tradition—of the LXX.: ὥσπερ στέλεχος φοίνικος; of the Itala: *sicut arbor palmæ*, and of the Vulg.: *sicut palma;* (3) and finally even the etymology of the word חוֹל (or חוּל, as the Rabbis of Nahardea read, according to Kimchi) which it would seem must be derived (with Bochart) from חול

torquere, volvere, and be explained "circulation, periodic return," and even in its Egyptian form *Koli* (Copt. : *alloe*) is to be traced back to this Shemitic radical signification (among the ancient Egyptians indeed the chief name of the phenix was *bêni*, hierogl. *bano*, *benno*, which at the same time signifies "palm"). The phrase—"to live as long as the phenix" is found also among other people of antiquity besides the Egyptians, *e. g.*, among the Greeks (φοίνικος ἔτη βιοῦν, Lucian, *Hermot.*, p. 53); and the whole legend concerning the phenix living for five hundred years, then burning itself together with its nest, and again living glorified, is in general as ancient as it is widely spread, especially in the East. Therefore it can neither seem strange, nor in any way objectionable, if a poetical book of the Holy Scripture should make reference to this myth (comp. the allusions to astronomical and other myths in ch. iii. 9; xxvi 28). Touching the proposition that the Egyptian nationality of the poet, or the Egyptian origin of his ideas does not follow from this passage, see above, Introd., § 7, *b* (where may also be found the most important literary sources of information respecting the legend of the phenix).

Vers. 19, 20 continue the expression, begun in ver. 18, of that which Job thought and hoped for. [According to E. V., ver. 19 resumes the description of Job's former condition: "My root *was* spread out, *etc*" But these two verses are so different from the passage preceding, (vers. 11-27), in which Job speaks of his deeds of beneficence, and from the passage following (vers. 21-25) in which he describes his influence in the public assembly, and so much in harmony with ver. 18, in which he speaks of his prospects, as they seemed to his hopes, that the connection adopted by Zöckler, and most recent expositors, is decidedly to be preferred.—E].

Ver. 19 **My root will be open towards the water**: *i. e.*, my life will flourish, like a tree plentifully watered (comp. chap. xiv. 7 seq.; xviii. 16), **and the dew will lie all night in my branches** (comp. the same passages; also Gen. xxvii. 39; Prov. xix. 12; Ps. cxxxiii. 3, *etc.*)

Ver. 20. **Mine honor will remain** (ever) **fresh with me** (כָּבוֹד = δόξα, consideration, dignity, honor with God and men—not "soul" as Hahn explains ["to which חָדָשׁ is not appropriate as predicate," Del.], **and my bow is renewed in my hand**—the bow as a symbol of robust manliness, and strength for action, comp. 1 Sam. ii. 4; Ps. xlvi. 10 [9]; lxxvi. 4 [3]; Jerem. xlix. 35; li. 56, *etc.*—הֶחֱלִיף, to make progress, to sprout forth (ch. xiv. 7); here to renew oneself, to grow young again. It is not necessary to supply, *e. g.*, כֹּחַ, as Hirzel and Schlottmann do, on the basis of Isa. xl. 31.

Ver. 21 seq., exhibit in connection with the joyful hopes of Job, just described, which flowed forth directly out of the fulness of his prosperity, and in particular of the honor which he enjoyed, a full description of this honor, the narrative style of the discourse by וָאֹמַר, ver. 18, being resumed. Vers. 21-23 have for their subject *others* than Job himself, the members of his tribe, not specially those who took part in the assemblies described in vers. 7-10; for which reason it is unnecessary to assume a transposition of the passage after ver. 10.

Ver. 21. **They hearkened to me, and waited** (יִחֵלּוּ, pausal form, with Dagh. euphonic for יְחַלּוּ, comp. Gesen. § 20, 2 *c*), **and listened silently to my counsel** (lit. "and were silent for or at my counsel").

Ver. 22. **After my words they spoke not again**—lit. "they did not repeat" (יִשְׁנוּ, *non iterabant*). On *b* comp. Deut. xxxii. 2; Cant. iv. 11; Prov. v. 3.

Ver. 23. Further expansion of the figure last used of the refreshing [rain-like] dropping of his discourse. **They opened their mouth wide as for the latter rain.**—The מַלְקוֹשׁ, or latter rain in March or April, is, on account of the approaching harvest, which it helps to ripen, longed for with particular urgency in Palestine and the adjacent countries; comp. Deut. xi. 14; Jer. iii. 3: v. 24; Joel ii. 23; Hos. vi. 3, *etc.* On פָּעַר פֶּה=שָׁאַף, to gape, pant, comp. Psalm cxix. 131.

Ver. 24. **I laughed upon them when they despaired**—lit. "when they did not have confidence" (הֶאֱמִין, absol. as in Isa. vii. 9; comp. Psalm cxvi. 10; and יַאֲמִינוּ is a circumstantial clause without וְ—this lacking וְ, however, being supplied in many MSS. and Eds.). The meaning can be only: "even when they were despondent, I knew how to cheer them up by my friendly smiles." This is the only meaning with which the second member agrees which cannot harmonize with the usual explanation: "I smiled at them, they believed it not" (LXX., Vulg., Saad., Luther [E. V., Noy., Rod., Ren., Merx], and most moderns). ["The reverence in which I was held was so great, that if I laid aside my gravity, and was familiar with them, they could scarcely believe that they were so highly honored; my very smiles were received with awe" Noyes]. **And the light of my countenance** (*i. e.*, my cheerful visage, comp. Prov. xvi. 15) **they could not darken**; lit. "they could not cause to fall, cast down," comp. Gen. iv. 5, 6; Jer. iii. 12.—["However despondent their position appeared, the cheerfulness of my countenance they could not cause to pass away." Del.]

Ver. 25. **I would gladly take the way to them** (comp. chap. xxviii. 23); *i. e.*, I took pleasure in sitting in the midst of them, and in taking part in affairs. This is the only meaning that is favored by what follows;—the rendering of Hahn and Delitzsch: "I chose out for them the way they should go" ["I made the way plain which they should take in order to get out of their hopeless and miserable state." Del. This is the meaning also suggested by E. V.] is opposed by the consideration that בחר, "to choose," never means "to prescribe, determine, enjoin." In the passage which follows, "sitting as chief" (ראשׁ) is immediately defined more in the concrete by the clause, כְּמֶלֶךְ בַּגְּדוּד, "like a

king in the midst of the army;" but then the altogether too military aspect of this figure (comp. chap. xv. 24; xix. 12) is again softened by making the business of the king surrounded by his armies to be not leading them to battle, but "comforting the mourners." Whether in this expression there is intended a thrust at the friends on account of their unskilful way of comforting (as Ewald and Dillmann think), may very much be doubted.

Second Division: The wretchedness of the present. Chap. xxx. *First Strophe* (or *Double Strophe*). vers. 1-15. The ignominy and contempt which he receives from men, put in glaring contrast with the high honor just described. The contrast is heightened all the more by the fact that the men now introduced as insulting and mocking him are of the very lowest and most contemptible sort; being the same class of men whose restless, vagabond life has already been described in ch. xxiv. 4-8, only more briefly than here.

Ver. 1. **And now they laugh at me who are younger than I in days**—the good-for-nothing rabble of children belonging to that abandoned class. What a humiliation for him before whom the aged stood up! ["The first line of the verse which is marked off by *Mercha-Mahpach* is intentionally so disproportionately long to form a deep and long-breathed beginning to the lamentation which is now begun." Del.] **They whose fathers I would have disdained to set with the dogs of my flock** (שִׁית עִם, "to make like, to put on a level with," not to set over, שִׁית עַל, *præficere*, as Schultens, Rosemn., Schlottm. explain). From this strong expression of contempt it does not follow that Job was now indulging in haughty or tyrannical inhuman thoughts [the considerate sympathy expressed by Job in ch. xxiv. 4-8 regarding this same class of men should be borne in mind in judging of Job's spirit here also; yet it cannot be denied that the pride of the grand dignified old Emir does flash through the words.—E.], but only that that rabble was immeasureably destitute, and moreover morally abandoned, thievish, false, improvident, and generally useless.

Ver. 2. **Even the strength of their hands —what should it be to me?**—*i. e.* "and even (LXX. καί γε) as regards themselves, those youngsters, of what use could the strength of their hands be to me?" Why this was of no use to him is explained in *b*: **for them full ripeness is lost,** *i. e.*, enervated, miserable creatures that they are, they do not once reach ripe manly vigor (כֶּלַח as in ch. v. 26). [Hence not "old age," as in E. V., which is both less correct and less expressive.] Why they do not, the verses immediately following show.

Ver. 3. **Through want and hunger** (they are) **starved**; lit. they are "a hard stiff rock" (גַּלְמוּד, as in ch. xv. 34); **they, who gnaw the dry steppe**; *i. e.*, gnaw away (עָרַק as in ver. 17) what grows there; comp. ch. xxiv. 5; **which have long been a wild and a wilderness.**—According to the parallel passages ch. xxxviii. 27; and Zeph. i. xv. שֹׁאָה וּמְשׁוֹאָה unquestionably signifies "waste and devastation," or "wild and wilderness" (comp. תהו ובהו, Gen. i. 2; בוקה ומבוקה, Nah. ii. 11; and similar examples of assonance). The אֶמֶשׁ preceding however is difficult. Elsewhere it is an adverb of time: "the past night, last evening [and so, yesterday]," but here evidently a substantive, and in the constr. state It is explained to mean either: "the yesterday of wasteness and desolation," *i. e.*, "that which has long been wasteness," *etc.* (Hirzel, Ewald) [Schlott., Renan, to whom may be added Good, Lee, Carey, Elzas, who connect אֶמֶשׁ with the participle, translating—"who yesterday were gnawers," *etc.*], or: "the night, the darkness of the wilderness" (Targ., Rabbis, Gesen., Del.) [Noyes, Words., Barnes, Bernard, Rodwell, the last two taking אמש, שׁי, and משׁי as three independent nouns,—"gloom, waste, desolation"]. Of these constructions the former is to be preferred, since darkness appears nowhere else (not even in Jer. ii. 6, 31) as a characteristic predicate of the wilderness," and since especially the "gnawing of the darkness of the wilderness" produces a thought singularly harsh. Dillmann's explanation: "already yesterday a pure wilderness" (where therefore there is nothing to be found to-day), is linguistically harsh; and Olshausen's emendation—אֶרֶץ שׁי ומי—arbitrary. [E. V., following the LXX. Targ., and most of the old expositors, translates הָעֹרְקִים "fleeing," a rendering which besides being far less vivid and forcible, is less suitable, the desert being evidently their proper habitation. ערק in the sense of "gnawing" reminds of טרף, ch. xxiv. 5. It will be seen also that E. V. follows the adverbial construction of אמש, but "the wilderness *in former time* desolate and waste" suggests no very definite or consistent meaning. If adverbial, the force of אמש must be to enhance the misery and hopelessness of their condition. They lived in what was not only now, but what had long been a desert—a fact which made the prospect of getting their support from it all the more cheerless.—E.].

Ver. 4. **They who pluck the salt-wort by the bushes**—in the place therefore where such small plants could first live, despite the scorching heat of the desert sun; in the shadow, that is, of larger bushes, especially of that perennial, branchy bush which is found in the Syrian desert under the name sîh, of which Wetzstein treats in Delitzsch.—מַלּוּחַ is the *orach*, or salt-wort (also sea-purslain, *atriplex halimus L.*, comp. LXX.: ἅλιμα), a plant which in its younger and more tender leaves furnishes some nourishment, although of a miserable sort; comp. Athenæus, *Deipnos.* IV., 161, where it is said of poor Pythagoreans: ἅλιμα τρώγοντες καὶ κακὰ τοιαῦτα συλλέγοντες.—**And broom-roots are their bread.**—That the root of the broom (*genista monosperma*) is edible, is indeed asserted only here; still we need not doubt it, nor read *e. g.*, לְחֻמָּם, "in order to warm themselves," (Gesenius), as though here as in Ps. cxx. 4, only the use of the broom as fuel was spoken of.

Comp. Michaelis. *Neue orient. Bibl.* V, 45, and Wetzstein in Del. [II., 143.—And see Smith's *Bib. Dic.*, "Juniper," "Mallows"].

Ver. 5. **Out of the midst** (of men) **they are hunted,** *e medio pelluntur.* גֵּו, lit. that which is within, *i. e.*, here the circle of human social life, human society.—**They cry after them as** (after) **a thief.** כַּגַּנָּב, as though they were a thief; comp. כַּמָּטָר, ch. xxix. 23.

Ver. 6. **In the most horrid gorges they must dwell**—lit. "in the horror of the gorges (*in horridissima vallium regione;* comp. ch. xli. 22; Ewald, § 313, *c*) it is for them to dwell;" comp. Gesen., § 132 (§ 129]. Rem. 1.—**In holes of the earth and of the rocks.** Hence they were genuine troglodytes; see below after ver. 8. Concerning עָפָר, "earth, ground," see on ch. xxviii. 2.

Ver. 7. **Among the bushes they cry out.** נהק above in ch. vi. 5 of the cry of the wild ass, here of the wild tones of the savage inhabitants of the steppes seeking food,—not their *sermo barbarus;* Pineda, Schlottmann [who refers to Herodotus' comparison of the language of the Ethiopian troglodytes to the screech of the night-owl. According to Delitzsch the word refers to their cries of lamentation and discontent over their desperate condition. There can be but little doubt that the word is intended to remind us of the comparison of these people to wild asses in ch. xxiv. 5, and so far the rendering of E. V. "bray," is not amiss]. **Under nettles** (brambles) **they herd together**; lit. "they must mix together, gather themselves." Most of the modern expositors render the Pual as a strict Passive, with the meaning, "they are poured [or stretched] out," which would be equivalent to—"they lie down" [or are prostrate]; comp. Amos vi. 4, 7. But both the use of ספח in such passages as 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; Is. xiv. 1, and the testimony of the most ancient Versions (Vulg., Targ., and indeed the LXX. also: διητῶντο) favor rather the meaning of herding, or associating together. ["But neither the *fut.* nor the *Pual* (instead of which one would expect the Niph., or Hithpa.) is favorable to the latter interpretation: wherefore we decide in favor of the former, and find sufficient support for a Heb.-Arabic ספח in the signification *effundere* from a comparison of ch. xiv. 19 and the present passage." Del.].

Ver. 8. **Sons of fools, yea, sons of base men,**—both expressions in opposition to the subject of the preceding verse. נבל is used as a collective, and means the ungodly, as in Ps. xiv. 1.—בְּלִי־שֵׁם, equivalent to *ignobiles, infames*, a construction similar to that in ch. xxvi. 2 [lit. "sons of no-name"]; comp. § 286, *g*.—**They are whipped out of the land**; lit. indeed an attributive clause—"who are whipped," *etc.;* hence *exiles*, those who are driven forth out of their own home. [The rendering of E. V., "they were viler than the earth" was doubtless suggested by the use of the adjective נָכָא in the sense of "afflicted, dejected"]. In view of the palpable identity of those pictured in these verses with those described in ch. xxiv. 4-8, it is natural to assume the existence of a particular class of men in the country inhabited by Job as having furnished the historical occasion and theme of both descriptions. Since now in both passages a troglodyte way of living (dwelling in clefts of the rock and in obscure places, comp. above ch. xxiv. 4, 8) and the condition of having been driven out of their former habitations (comp. ch. xxiv. 4) are mentioned as prominent characteristics of these wretched ones, it becomes particularly probable that the people intended are the *Choreans*, or *Chorites* (Luther: *Horites*) [E. V.: "Horims"] who dwelt in holes, the aborigines of the mountain region of Seir, who were in part subjugated by the Edomites, in part exterminated, in part expelled (comp. Gen. xxxvi. 5; Deut. ii. 12, 22). Even if Job's home is to be looked for at some distance from Edomitis, *e. g.* in Hauran (comp. on. ch. i. 1) a considerable number of such Chorites (חוֹרִים, *i. e.* dwellers in holes, or caves) might have been living in his neighborhood; for driven out by the Edomites, they would have fled more particularly into the neighboring regions of Seir-Edom, and here indeed again they would have betaken themselves to the mountains with their caves, gorges, where they would have lived the same wretched life as their ancestors, who had been left behind in Edom. It is less likely that a cave-dwelling people in Hauran, *different* from these remnants of the Horites, are intended, *e. g.* the Itureans, who were notorious for their poverty, and waylaying mode of life (Del. and Wetzst.).

Ver. 9. In the second half of the Long Strophe, which also begins with וְעַתָּה Job turns his attention away from the wretches whom he has been elaborately describing back to himself. **And now I am become their song of derision, I am become to them for a byword.**—נְגִינָה, elsewhere a stringed instrument, means here a song of derision, σίλλος (comp. Lam. iii. 14; Ps. lxix. 13 [12], מִלָּה, malicious, defamatory speech referring to the subject of the same (LXX.: θρύλλημα).

Ver. 10. **Abhorring me, they remove far from me** (to wit, from very abhorrence), **yea, they have not spared my face with spitting**; *i. e. when* at any time they come near me, it is never without testifying their deepest contempt by spitting in my face (Matt. xxvi. 67; xxvii. 30). An unsuitable softening of the meaning is attempted by those expositors, who find expressed here merely "a spitting in his presence" (Hirzel, Umbreit, Schlottmann); this meaning would require לִפְנֵי rather than מִפְּנֵי. Comp. also above ch. xvii. 6, where Job calls himself a תֹּפֶת לְפָנִים for the people.

Ver. 11 seq. show why Job had been in such a way given over to be mocked at by the most wretched, because namely *God and the divine powers which cause calamity had delivered him over to the same.* For these are the principal subject in vers. 11-14, not those miserable outcasts of human society just spoken of (as Rosenm., Umbreit, Hirzel, Stickel, Schlottm., Del. [Noy., Car., Rod. and appy. E. V.] explain). The correct view is given by LXX. and Vulg., and

among the moderns by Ewald, Arnh., Hahn, Dillm., *etc.* **For He hath loosed my cord.** So according to the K'ri יִתְרִי, on the basis of which we may also explain: "For He hath loosed, slackened *my string*," which would be an antithetic reference to ch. xxix. 20 *b*, even as by the translation "cord" there would be a retrospective reference to ch. iv. 21; xxvii. 8. If following the K'thibh we read יִתְרוֹ, the explanation would be: "He has loosed His cord, or rein, with which he held the powers of adversity chained," with which however the following clause: "and bowed me" would not agree remarkably well [not a conclusive objection, for עִנָּה might very appropriately and forcibly describe the way in which his nameless persecutor, God doubtless, would overpower, trample him down, by letting loose His horde of calamities upon Job. Comp. Ps. lxxviii. 8 [7]. Conant not very differently: "because he has let loose his rein and humbled me;" *i. e.* with unchecked violence has humbled me. Ewald, less naturally: "He hath opened (*i. e.* taken off the covering of) His string (=his bow). Elizabeth Smith better: "He hath let go His bow-string, and afflicted me." פִּתַּח in the sense of letting loose a bow, or bow-string however, is not used elsewhere, and וַיְעַנֵּנִי would hardly be a suitable description of the effect of shooting with the bow.—E.]. **And the rein have they let loose before me**; *i. e.*, have let go before me (persecuting me). The subject of this, as of the following verses, is indisputably God's hosts let loose against Job, the same which in the similar former description in ch. xix. 12 were designated his גְדוּדִים (comp. also ch. xvi. 9, 12-14). The fearful, violent, and even irresistible character of their attacks on Job, especially as described in vers. 13, 14, is not suited to the miserable class described in vers. 1-8. They are either angels of calamity, or at least diseases and other evils, or, generally speaking, the personified agencies of the Divine wrath, that Job has here in mind.

Ver. 12. **On the right there rises up a brood,** or troop. פִּרְחַח, or according to another reading פִּרְחָה, lit. "a sprouting, a luxuriant flourishing plant." [E. V., after the Targ. Rabbis, "the youth," which is both etymologically and exegetically to be rejected.—E.] This calamitous brood (of diseases, *etc.*) rises *on the right*, in the sense that they appear against Job as his accusers (comp. ch. xvi. 8); for the accusers before a tribunal took their place at the right of the accused; comp. Zech. iii. 1; Ps. cix. 6.—**They push away my feet,** *i. e.*, they drive me ever further and further into straits, they would leave me no place to stand on. (Ewald's emendation רַגְלָם—"they let loose their feet, set them quickly in motion"—is unnecessary)—**And cast up against me their destructive ways,** in that they heap up their siege-walls against me, the object of their blockade and hostile assaults. סלל, as in ch. xix. 12, a passage which agrees almost verbally with the one before us, and so confirms our interpretation of the latter as referring to the Divine persecutions as an army beleaguering him. [Not only is this view favored by such a use of the *same* language as has been used elsewhere (ch. xix.) of the Divine persecutions, but also by the language itself. It is scarcely conceivable that Job should dignify the spiteful gibes and jeers of that rabble of young outcasts by comparing them to the solemn accusations of a judicial prosecution, or the regular siege of an army.—E.]

Ver. 13. **They tear down my path**; *i. e.*, by heaping up their ways of destruction they destroy my own heretofore undisturbed way of life.—**They help to my destruction** (comp. Zech. i 15)—**they to whom there is no helper**: *i. e.*, who need no other help for their work of destruction, who can accomplish it alone. So correctly Stickel, Hahn, while most modern expositors find in *c* the idea of helplessness, or that of being despised or forsaken by all the world, to be expressed. Ewald however [so Con.] explains: "there is no helper *against them*" (appealing to Ps. lxviii. 21); and Dillmann doubts whether there can be a satisfactory explanation of the text, which he holds to be corrupt.

Ver. 14. **As through a wide breach** (כְּפֶרֶץ an elliptical comparison, like כַּגַּנָּב ver. 5) **they draw nigh** [come on]; **under the crash they roll onwards,** *i. e.*, of course to storm completely the fortress; comp. ch. xvi. 14. The "crash," שֹׁאָה, is that of the falling ruins of the walls [breached by the assault] not that, *e. g.*, of a roaring torrent, as Hitzig explains (*Zeitschr. der D.—M. G.*, IX. 741), who at the same time attempts to give to פֶּרֶץ the unheard of signification, "forest stream." [Targ. also; "like the force of the far-extending waves of the sea," after which probably E. V., "as a wide breaking-in of waters." But the fig. is evidently that of an inrushing army.—E.]

Ver. 15. **Terrors are turned against me;** *i. e.*, sudden death-terrors; comp. ch. xviii. 11, 14; xxvii. 20; **they pursue like the storm,** (like an all-devastating hurricane) **my dignity** (נְדִבָתִי) [not "soul," E. V., probably after the analogy of כָּבוֹד frequently in Psalms] that, *viz.*, which was described in ch. xxix. 20 seq. The 3d sing. fem. תִּרְדֹּף referring to the plur. בַּלָּהוֹת as in ch. xiv. 19; xxvii. 20, and often.—**And** (in consequence of all that) **like a cloud my prosperity is gone**; *i. e.*, it has vanished as quickly and completely—leaving no trace—as a cloud vanishes on the face of heaven. Comp. ch. vii. 9; Isa. xliv. 22. [Paronomasia between עָב and עָבְרָה: "my prosperity like a vapor has vanished"].

6. *Continuation. Second Strophe:* The unspeakable misery of the sufferer: vers. 16-23.—**And now** (the third וְעַתָּה, comp. vers. 1 and 8) **my soul is poured out within me,** dissolving in anguish and complaint, flowing forth in tears ["since the outward man is, as it were, dissolved in the gently flowing tears (Isa. xv. 3) his soul flows away as it were in itself, for the outward incident is but the manifestations and results of an inward action." Del.] On עָלַי, "with me, in me," comp. ch. x. 1; Ps. xlii. 5 [E. V., too literally—"upon me"].—**Days of suffering hold me fast,** *i. e.*, in their power,

they will not depart from me with their evil effects ["עֳנִי with its verb, and the rest of its derivatives is the proper word for suffering, and especially the passion of the Servant of Jehovah." Del.]

Ver. 17. **The night pierces my bones.**—["The night has been personified already, ch. iii. 2; and in general, as Herder once said, Job is the brother of Ossian for personifications: Night, (the restless night, ch. vii. 3 seq., in which every malady, or at least the painful feeling of it increases) pierces his bones from him." Del.] Or a translation which is equally possible, "by night my bones are pierced" [E. V., *etc.*], inasmuch as נִקַּר can be Niph. as well as Piel. מֵעָלָי, lit. "away from me," *i. e.*, "so that they are detached from me."—**And my gnawers sleep not**; *i. e.*, either "my gnawing pains," or "my worms, the maggots in my ulcers;" comp. רִמָּה, ch. vii. 5 ["and which in the extra biblical tradition of Job's disease are such a standing feature, that the pilgrims to Job's monastery even now-a-days take away with them thence these supposed petrified worms of Job." Del.] In any case עֹרְקַי is to be explained after עָרַק ver. 3. The signification "veins" (Blumenth), or "nerves, sinews" (LXX., νεῦρα, Parchon, Kimchi) [E.V.] is without support.

Ver. 18. **By omnipotence my garment is distorted**; *i. e.*, by God's fearful power I am so emaciated that my garment hangs about me loose and flapping, no longer looking like an article of clothing (comp. ch. xix. 20). This is the only interpretation (Ewald, Delitzsch, Dillm., Kamphausen, [E. V., Con., Words., Ren.] *etc.*), that agrees with the contents of the second member, not that of the LXX., who read יִתְפֹּשׂ instead of יתחפש, and understood God to be the subject; πολλῇ ἰσχύι ἐπελάβετο μου τῆς στολῆς; nor that of Hirzel: "by omnipotence my garment is *exchanged*," *i. e.*, for a sack; nor that of Schult. and Schlott.: "it (*i. e.*, the suffering, the pain) is changed into [become] my garment," *etc.* [with the idea of disguise, disfigurement].—**It girds me round like the collar of my** [closely-fitting] **coat**; *i. e*, my garment, which nowhere fits me at all, clings to my body as closely and tightly as a shirt-collar fastens around the neck. ["יַאַזְרֵנִי, *cingit me*, is not merely the falling together of the outer garment, which was formerly filled out by the members of the body, but its appearance when the sick man wraps himself in it; then it girds him, fits close to him like his shirt-collar." Del.] The LXX. already translate כְּפִי כֻתָּנְתִּי correctly: ὥσπερ τὸ περιστόμιον τοῦ χιτῶνός μου (Vulg. *quasi capitium tunicæ*) [E. V.].—To render כְּפִי "as," or "in proportion to" yields no rational sense (comp. also Ex. xxviii. 32).

Ver. 19. **He** (God) **hath cast me into the mire** (a sign of the deepest humiliation, comp. ch. xvi. 15) **so that I am become like dust and ashes** (in consequence of the earth like, dirty appearance of my skin, comp. ch. vii. 5, a theme to which he recurs again at the close of the chapter, ver. 30)

Vers. 20–23. A plaintive appeal to God, entreating help, but entreating it without a hope of being heard by God.—**I stand there** (praying) **and Thou lookest fixedly at me**, *viz.*, without hearing me. This is the only interpretation of the second member which agrees well with the first, not that of Ewald: "if I remain standing, then Thou turnest Thy attention to me," in order to oppose. [Ewald preferring the reading ויתחכנן]. It is absolutely impossible with the Vulg., Saad., Gesen., Umbreit, Welte, [E. V., Ber.] to carry over the לֹא of the first member to ותתבנן—"I stand up, and Thou regardest me not." ["The effect of לֹא cannot be repeated in the second member, after a change of subject, and in a clause which is dependent on the action of that subject." Con."]

Ver. 21. **Thou changest Thyself to a cruel being towards me**.—אַכְזָר *sævus*, comp. ch. xli. 2 [10], also the softened אַיב in the derivative passage, Is. lxiii. 10.—On שׂטם in *b*, [**with the strength of Thy hand Thou makest war upon me**], comp. ch xvi. 9.

Ver. 22. **Raising me upon a stormy wind** (as on a chariot, comp. 2 Kings ii. 11) [not exactly "to the wind" (E. V., Con., Words., *etc.*), as though Job were made the sport of the wind, *ludibrium ventis*, but flung upon it, and whirled by it down from the heights of his prosperity.—E.]. **Thou causest me to be borne away** (comp. ch. xxvii. 21) **and makest me to dissolve in the crash of the storm.**—The last word is to be read after the K'thibh, with Ewald, Olsh., Del., *etc.*, תְּשֻׁיָּה, and to be regarded as an alternate form of תְּשׁוּאָה, or תְּשֻׁאָה (comp. xxxvi. 29), and hence as being essentially synonymous with שׁוֹאָה, Prov. i. 27, "tempest," and as to its construction an accus. of motion, like מָוֶת in the following verse. [Ges., Umbr., Noyes, Carey, read תְּשַׁוֵּה, "Thou terrifiest me," a verb unknown in Heb., and even in Chaldee used only in Ithpeal. See Delitzsch.] The K'ri תֻּשִׁיָּה (of which the LXX. have made תְּשׁוּעָה) would give a meaning less in harmony with *a*: "Thou causest well-being to dissolve for me" [E. V.: "Thou dissolvest my substance" But the other rendering is a far more suitable close to the whole description, which is fearfully magnificent, besides being entitled to the ordinary preference for the K'thibh].

Ver. 23. **I know that Thou wilt bring me to death** (or "bring me back"—השׁיב in the sense of שׁוּב, ch. i. 21) ["death being represented as essentially one with the dust of death, or even with non-existence," Delitzsch, who, however, denies that שׁוּב always and inexorably includes an "again"], **into the house of assembly for all living**.—The latter expression, which is to be understood in the sense of ch. iii. 17 seq., is in apposition to מָוֶת, and this is used here as a synonym of שְׁאוֹל, as in ch. xxviii. 22.

Conclusion: Third Strophe: vers. 24 31: The diappointment of all his hopes.

Ver. 24. **But still doth not one stretch out the hand in falling?**—אַךְ here an adver-

sative particle, as in ch. xvi. 7; לֹא, however, interrogative for הֲלֹא, comp. ch. ii. 10 *b*. The view that בְּעִי is compounded of בְּ and עִי, "ruin, fall, destruction" (comp. Mic. i. 6, also the more frequent plur., עִיִּים, ruins), is favored by the parallel expression בְּפִידוֹ in the second member. שָׁלַח יָד finally, in the sense of stretching out the hands in *supplication, prayer*, is at least indirectly supported by Ex. xvii. 11 seq., and similar passages (such as Ex. ix. 29; 1 Kings viii. 38; Is. i. 15; lxv. 2, *etc.*).—**Or in his overthrow** (will one not lift up) **a cry on that account?**—The interrogative הֲלֹא=לֹא extends its influence still over the second member. The suffix in בְּפִידוֹ refers back to the indefinite subject in יִשְׁלַח, and belongs therefore to the same one overtaken by the fall, and threatened with destruction (פִּיד as in ch. xii. 5). Respecting לָהֶן "on that account, therefore," see Ewald, § 217, *d;* and on שׁוּעַ=שַׁוְעָה, "a cry," comp. ch. xxxvi. 19 *a*.—It is possible that instead of the harsh expression לָהֶן שׁוּעַ we should read something like לֹא יְשַׁוֵּעַ (according to Dillmann's conjecture). On the whole the explanation here propounded of this verse, which was variously misunderstood by the ancient versions and expositors, gives the only meaning suited to the context, for which reason the leading modern commentators (Ewald, Hirzel, Delitzsch, Dillmann, and on the whole Hahn, *etc.*) adhere to it. [Delitzsch thus explains the connection: "He knows that he is being hurried forth to meet death; he knows it, and has also already made himself so familiar with this thought, that the sooner he sees an end put to this his sorrowful life, the better—nevertheless does one not stretch out one's hand when one is falling? . . . or in his downfall raise a cry for help?" As Dillmann remarks, this meaning is striking in itself (besides being simple and natural), and is in admirable harmony with the context. The E. V., after some of the Rabbis, takes עִי in the sense of "grave," although the meaning of its rendering is obscure. It would seem to be that God will not stretch out His hand, in the way of deliverance, to the grave, although when He begins to destroy, men cry out for mercy. Wordsworth translates: "But only will He (God) not stretch out His hand (to help, see Prov. xxxi. 20; Hab. iii. 10) upon me, who am like a desolation or a ruin? And will not crying therefore (reach Him) in His destruction of me?"—Others (Ges., Con., Noyes, Carey, take בְּעִי (from בָּעָה) to mean "prayer:" "Yea, there is no prayer, when He stretches out the hand; nor when He destroys can they cry for help," which is not so well suited to the connection, and is against the parallelism which makes it probable that בְּ before עִי is a preposition as before פִּיד.—E.]

Ver. 25. **Or did I not weep for him that was in trouble?** lit. for "the hard of day," **for "him that is afflicted by a** *day*" (a day of calamity). On *b* comp. ch. xix. 12, 15 seq. The ἀπ. λεγ. עָגַם, "to be troubled, grieved," is not different in sense from אָגַם, Is. xix. 10.

Ver. 26. **For I hoped for good, and there came evil,** *etc.*—For the thought comp. Is. lix. 9; Jer. xiv. 19. Respecting וָאֲיַחֲלָה (Imperf. cons. Piel), comp. Ewald, § 232, *h;* the strengthening ה ָ in the final vowel as in ch. i. 15.

Ver. 27. In regard to the "boiling" (רתח as in ch. xli. 23 [31]) of the bowels, comp. Lam. i. 20; ii. 11; Is. xvi. 11; Jer. xxxi. 20, *etc.* ["My bowels boiled." E. V., does not quite express the Pual רֻתְּחוּ, "are made to boil," the result of an external cause.] On קִדֵּם, "to encounter any one, to fall upon him" [E. V. "prevent" obsolete], comp. Ps. xviii. 6 [5].

Ver. 28. **I go along blackened, without the heat of the sun,** *i. e.* not by the heat of the sun, not as one that is burnt by the heat of the sun. Since חַמָּה (comp. Cant. vi. 10; Is. xxx. 26) denotes the sun as regards its heat, בְּלֹא חַמָּה (instead of which the Pesh. and Vulg. read בְּלֹא חַמָּה) is not to be explained "without the sun light=in inconsolable darkness" (so Hahn, Delitzsch, Kamp.) [and probably E. V.: "I went mourning without the sun"]; which is all the less probable in that קֹדֵר can scarcely denote anything else than the dirty appearance of a mourner, covered with dust and ashes (comp. ch. vii. 5), such a blackening of the skin accordingly as would present an obvious contrast with that produced by the heat of the sun. On הִלֵּךְ comp. ch. xxiv. 10.—**I stand up in the assembly, complaining aloud,** giving free expression to my pain on account of my sufferings. קָהָל here indeed not of the popular assembly in the gates—for the time was long since passed, when he, the leper, might take his place there (comp. ch. xxix. 7 seq.)—but the assembly of mourners, who surrounded him in, or near his house, and who, we are to understand, were by no means limited to the three friends. The opinion of Hirzel and Dillmann, that בַּקָּהָל means *publice*, is without support; בְּקָהָל, Prov. xxvi. 26 argues against this signification, rather than *for* it, for there in fact the language does refer to an assembly of the people, not to any other gathering.

Ver. 29. **I am become a brother to jackals** [Vulg., E. V.: "dragons"], **a companion of ostriches** [E. V. here as elsewhere incorrectly "owls"], *i. e.* in respect to the loud, mournful howling of these animals of the desert (see Mic. i. 8). The reference is not so well taken to their solitariness, although this also may be taken into the account; for the life of a leper, shut off from all intercourse with the public, and put out of the city, must at all times be comparatively deserted, notwithstanding all the groups of sympathizing visitors, who might occasionally gather about him. [See note in Delitzsch ii. 171; also Smith's Bib. Dict. "Dragon," "Ostrich."]

Ver. 30. **My skin, being black, peels off from me**: lit. "is become black from me." מֵעָלַי as in ver. 17; the blackness of the skin (produced by the heat of the disease) as in ver. 19 [where, however, it is referred rather to the dirt adhering to it]; comp. ch. vii. 5.—Respecting חרה from חרר, "to glow, to be hot," comp. Ezek. xxiv. 11; Is. xxiv. 6.

Ver. 31 forms a comprehensive close to the whole preceding description: **And so my harp** (comp. ch. xxi. 12) **was turned to mourning, and my pipe** (comp. the same passage) **to tones of lamentation**; lit. "to the voice of the weeping." Job's former cheerfulness and joyousness (comp. ch. xxix. 24) appears here under the striking emblem of the tones of musical instruments sounding forth clearly and joyously, but now become mute. Similar descriptions in Ps. xxx. 12 [11]; Lam. v. 15; Amos viii. 10, *etc.* ["Thus the second part of the monologue closes. . . . It is Job's last sorrowful lament before the catastrophe. What a delicate touch of the poet is it that he makes this lament, ver. 31, die away so melodiously. One hears the prolonged vibration of its elegiac strains. The festive and joyous music is hushed; the only tones are tones of sadness and lament, *mesto flebile.*" Delitzsch].

Third Division: Job's asseveration of his innocence in presence of the God of the future: ch. xxxi.

First Strophe: Vers. 1-8. The avoidance of all sinful lust, which he had constantly practiced.—**A covenant have I made with mine eyes, and how should I fix my gaze on a maiden?** *i. e.*, with adulterous intent (comp. *πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν*, Matth. v. 28; comp. Sir. ix. 5). The whole verse affirms that Job had not once violated the marriage covenant in which he lived (and which, ch. ii. 9—comp. ch. xix. 17—shows to have been monogamous) by adulterous inclinations, to say nothing of unchaste actions. In respect to the significance of this utterance of a godly man in the patriarchal age, in connection with the history of morals and civilization, comp. below "Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks." The words כָּרַת בְּרִית לְעֵינַי (לְ instead of אֶת־ or עִם־) are literally rendered: "*to prescribe, to dictate* a covenant to the eyes. Job appears accordingly as the superior, prescribing to his organ of vision its conduct, dictating to it all the conditions of the agreement. It is unnecessary, and even erroneous, to translate the verbs as pluperfects ("I *had* made a covenant— . . how should I have looked upon," *etc.*—so *e. g.*, Umbreit, Hahn, Vaih.), for Job would by no means describe these principles of chastity, which he observed, as something belonging merely to the earlier past.

Vers. 2-4 continue the reflections, beginning with ver. 1 *b*, which had restrained him from unchaste lusts, and this in the form of three questions, of which the first (ver. 2) is answered by the second and third (vers. 3 and 4).—**And** (—thus did I think—) **what would be the dispensation of Eloah from above?**—חֵלֶק is the portion assigned by God, the dispensation of His just retribution; comp. ch. xx. 29; xxvii. 13, where also may be found the parallel נַחֲלָה, "inheritance." On מִמַּעַל, "from above," comp. ch. xvi. 19; xxv. 2; and in particular such New Testament passages as Rom. i. 18 (*ἀπ' ουρανοῦ*), James i. 17 (*ἄνωθεν*), *etc.*

Ver. 3 seq. The answer to that question itself given in the form of a question. On אֵיד comp. above on ch. xxx. 12; on עַוָּל, ch. xviii. 21; on נֵכֶר "calamity," Obad. 12.

Ver. 4. **Doth not He** (הוּא, referring back to אֱלוֹהַּ, ver. 2) [and emphatic: *He*—doth He not see, *etc.*] **see my ways, and doth He not count all my steps?**—Comp. Ps. cxxxix. 2 seq. It was accordingly the thought of God as the omniscient heavenly Judge, which influenced Job to avoid most rigidly even such sinful desires and thoughts as were merely internal!

Vers. 5-8. The first in the series of the many adjurations, beginning with אִם, in which Job continues the assertion of his innocence to the close of the discourse.—**If I have walked [had intercourse] with falsehood** (שָׁוְא here as a synonym of the following מִרְמָה, not simply "vanity" [E. V.] but "falsehood, a false nature, lying") **and my foot hath hastened to deceit.**—וַתַּחַשׁ from a verb חָשָׁה, not found elsewhere; and signifying not "to be silent," but "to hasten" (like חוּשׁ) is an alternate form of the more common חוּשׁ (comp. וַיַּעַט, 1 Sam. xv. 19, from a root עָטָה, synonymous with עִיט).

Ver. 6. Parenthetic demand upon God, that He should be willing to prove the truth of Job's utterances (not the consequent of the hypothetic antecedent in the preceding verse, as Delitzsch [E. V.], would make it).—**Let Him** (God) **weigh me in a just balance**; or "in the balance of justice," the same emblem of the decisive Divine judgment to which the inscription in the case of Belshazzar refers (Dan. v. 25), and which appears in the proverbial language of the Arabs as "the balance of works;" in like manner among the Greeks as an attribute of *Themis*, or *Dike*, *etc.*

Ver. 7. Continuation of the asseveratory antecedent in ver. 5, introduced by an Imperf. of the Past—expressing the continuousness of the actions described—interchanging with the Perf. (as again below in vers. 13, 16-20, *etc.*)—**If my steps turned aside from the way**, *i. e.*, from the *right* way, prescribed by God (comp. ch. xxiii. 11), which is forsaken when, as the thought is expressed in *b*, one "walks after his own eyes," *i. e.*, allows himself to be swayed by the lusts of the eye (comp. Jer. xviii. 12; 1 John ii. 16).—**And a spot cleaved to my hands**, to wit, a spot of immoral actions, especially such as are avaricious. Comp. Ps. vii. 4 [3] seq.; Deut. xiii. 17, *etc.*—מאוּם instead of the usual form מוּם (comp. ch. xi. 15), found also Dan. i. 4.

Ver. 8. Consequent: **then shall I sow and another eat**; *i. e.*, the fruits of my labor shall be enjoyed by another, instead of myself (because I have stained it by the fraudulent appropriation of the property of others); the same

thought as above in ch. xxvii. 16 seq.; comp. Lev. xxvi. 16; Deut. xxviii. 33; Amos v. 11, *etc.* —**And may my products be rooted out!** צֶאֱצָאִים used here not of children, offspring [E. V.] (as in ch. v. 25; xxi. 8; xxvii. 14), but according to *a* of the growth of the soil as planted by the owner, which so far as it shall not fall into the hands of others shall be destroyed (comp. Is. xxxiv. 1; xlii. 5).

9. *Continuation. Second Strophe:* Vers. 9–15. The righteousness which he had exercised in all the affairs of his domestic life.—**If my heart has been befooled on account of** [**or enticed towards**] **a woman;** *i. e.*, a married woman,—for the sins of which Job here acquits his conscience are those of the *more flagrant* sort, like David's transgression with Bathsheba, not simple acts of unchastity, such as were described above in ver. 1.—As to *b*, comp. ch. xxiv. 15, and particularly Prov. vii. 7 seq.

Ver. 10. Consequent: **Then let my wife grind for another;** *i. e.*, not simply grind with the hand-mill for him as his slave (Ex. xi. 5; Isa. xlvii. 2; Matth. xxiv. 41), but according to the testimony of the Ancient Versions (LXX., Vulg., Targ.) and the Jewish expositors—it refers to sexual intercourse in concubinage—this obscene sense being still more distinctly expressed in *b*.—אַחֲרִין, Aram. plur. as in ch. iv. 2; xxiv. 22.

Vers. 11, 12. Energetic expression of detestation for the sin of adultery just mentioned.—**For such a thing** (הוּא) [**this**] **would be an infamous act, and that** (הִיא) **a sin** [**crime to be brought**] **before the judges.**—So according to the K'thibh, which with הוא points back to that which is mentioned in ver. 9, but with היא points back to זִמָּה, "transgression, deed of infamy" ["the usual Thora-word for the shameless, subtle encroachments of sensual desires." Del.], while the K'ri unnecessarily reads הוּא in both instances—עָוֺן פְּלִילִים would be, so written (with עָוֺן in the absol. state) = *crimen, et crimen quidem judicum* (comp. Gesen., § 116 [§ 114] Rem.). Still the conjecture is natural that we are to read either, as in ver. 28 עֲוֺן פְּלִילִי *cr. judiciale*, or, עֲוֺן פְּלִילִים, *cr. judicum.* The meaning of the expression is furthermore similar to ἔνοχος τῇ κρίσει, Matth. v. 21 seq.

Ver. 12. **For it would be a fire which would devour even to the abyss,** *i. e.*, which would not rest before it had brought me, consumed by a wicked adulterous passion, to merited punishment in the abyss of hell; comp. Prov. vi. 27 seq.; vii. 26 seq.; Sir. ix. 8; James iii. 6, and in respect to אֲבַדּוֹן see above ch. xxvi. 6; xxviii. 22,—**and which would root out all my increase,** *i. e.*, burn out the roots beneath it. The בְּ before כָּל־תְּבוּאָתִי may be expressed by the translation: "and which should undertake the act of outrooting *upon* my whole produce," (Delitzsch) [*Beth objecti*, corresponding to the Greek genitive expressing not an entire full coincidence, but an action about and upon the object. See Ewald, § 217].

Ver. 13 seq. A new adjuration touching the humane friendliness of Job's conduct toward his *house-slaves.* **If I despised the right of my servant, of my maid**—if those who were often treated as absolutely without any rights, certainly not on the basis of the Mosaic law (comp. Ex. xxi. 1 seq., 20 seq.). Job, the patriarchal saint, appears accordingly in this respect also as a fore-runner of the theocratic spirit; comp. Abraham's relations to Eliezer, Gen. xv. 2; xxiv. 2 seq.

Ver. 14. **What should I do when God arose?** *etc.* Umbreit, Stickel, Vaih., Welte, Delitzsch [E. V. Con., Carey, Noy., Words., Merx], correctly construe this verse as the apodosis of the preceding, here exceptionally introduced by וְ, not as a parenthetic clause, which would then have no consequent after it (Ewald, Hirzel, Dillmann), [Schlottmann, Renan, Rod., Elz.]. In respect to the "rising up" of God, to wit, for judgment, comp. ch. xix. 25; on פקד to "inquire into," comp. Ps. xvii. 3; on הֵשִׁיב, "to reply," ch. xiii. 22.

Ver. 15. **In the womb did not my Maker make him** (also), **and did not One** (אֶחָד, one and the same God) **fashion us in the belly?** וַיְכֻנֶנּוּ, syncopated Pilel-form, with suffix of the 1st pers. plur., for וַיְכוֹנְנֵנוּ (Ewald, § 81, *a;* comp. § 250, *a*). For the thought comp. on the one side, ch. x. 8-12; on the other side the use made of the identity of creation and community of origin on the part of masters and servants as a motive for the humane treatment of the latter by the former in Eph. vi. 9 (also Mal. ii. 10). [The position of בבטן gives some emphasis to the thought that *the womb* is the common source of our earthly life, or as Delitzsch expresses it, that God has fashioned us in the womb "in an equally animal way," a thought "which smites down all pride."—E.].

Continuation. Third Strophe; vers. 16-23: His righteous and merciful conduct toward his neighbors, or in the sphere of *civil* life (comp. above ch. xxix. 12-17). After the first hypothetic antecedent, in ver. 16, follows immediately the parenthesis, in ver. 18, then three new antecedent passages, beginning with אִם (or אִם־לֹא), until finally, in ver. 22, the common consequent of these four antecedents is stated. **If I refused to the poor their desire** [**or, if I held back the poor from their desire**] (מנע construed otherwise than in ch. xxii. 7; comp. Eccles. ii. 10; Num. xxiv. 11); **and caused the widow's eyes to fail**—from looking out with yearning for help; comp. ch. xi. 20; xvii. 5; and in particular on כִּלָּה comp. Lev. xxvi. 16; 1 Sam. ii. 33.

Ver. 18. Parenthesis, repudiating the thought that he could have treated widows or orphans so cruelly as he had just described—introduced by כִּי in the signification—"nay, rather" comp. Ps. cxxx. 4; Mich. vi. 4, and often). **Nay indeed from my youth he grew up to me as to a father,** *viz.*, the orphan; the position of the subjects in respect to those of ver. 16 and ver. 17 is chiastic [inverted]. The suffix in גְּדֵלַנִי has the force of a dative (Ewald, § 315, *b*), and כְּאָב

is an elliptical comparison for כְּמוֹ־לְאָב. The conjecture of Olshausen, who would read גִּדְּלַנִי "he honored [magnified] me," is unnecessary. **And from the womb I was her guide.**—Occasioned by the parallel expression מִנְּעוּרַי in *a*, the meaning of which it is intended to intensify, the phrase מִבֶּטֶן אִמִּי, "from my mother's womb," *i. e.* from my birth, presents itself as a strong hyperbole, designed to show that Job's humane and friendly treatment of widows and orphans began with his earliest youth; he had drank it in so to speak with his mother's milk. ["So far back as he can remember, he was wont to behave like a father to the orphan, and like a child to the widow." Del.].

Ver. 19. **If I saw the forsaken one** [or: **one perishing**] **without clothing,** *etc.* אוֹבֵד as in ch. xxix. 13; מִבְּלִי, as in ch. xxiv. 7. The second member וְאֵין וגו׳ forms a second object to אֶרְאֶה, lit. "and (saw) the not-being of the poor with covering."

Ver. 20. In respect to the blessing pronounced by the grateful poor (the blessing described as proceeding from his warmed hips and loins, which in a truly poetic manner are named instead of himself) comp. ch. xxix. 13.

Ver. 21. **If I shook my hand over the orphan** (with intent of doing violence, comp. Is. xi. 15; xix. 16) ["as a preparation for a crushing stroke"], **because I saw my help in the gate** (*i. e.* before the tribunal, comp. ch. xxix. 7)—a reference to the bribery which he had practiced upon the judges, or to any other abuse of his great influence for the perversion of justice.

Ver. 22. Consequent, corresponding immediately to ver. 21, but having a wider reference to all the antecedents from ver. 16 on, even though the sins described in the former ones of the number were not specially committed by the hand, or arm. **Then let my shoulder fall from its shoulder-blade.**—כָּתֵף signifies shoulder, or upper arm, even as אֶזְרֹעַ in *b* designates the arm. שְׁכֶם is the nape, which supports the upper arm, or shoulder (together with the shoulder-blades); קָנֶה "a pipe," but used to denote the shoulder-joint to which the arm is attached; less probably the hollow bone of the arm itself (against Delitzsch). Concerning the ה *raphatum* in the suffixes שִׁכְמָה and קָנָה, comp. Ewald. § 21, f; 247, d.

Ver. 23. Assigning the reason for what precedes, sustaining the same relation to ver. 22, as ver. 11 seq to ver. 10. **For the destruction of God** (comp. ver. 3) **is a terror for me** (אֵלַי meaning "in mine eyes," comp. Eccles. ix. 13), **and before His majesty** (מִן compar.; שְׂאֵת as in ch. xiii. 11) **I am powerless**—I can do nothing, I possess no power of resistance. Job emphasizes thus strongly his fear and entire impotence before God, in order to show that it would be morally impossible for him to be guilty of such practices, as those last described. The hypothetic rendering of the verse: "for terror might [or ought to] come upon me, the destruction of God" (Del., Kamph.) is impossible.

11. *Continuation. Fourth Strophe:* vers. 24-32. Job's conscientiousness in the discharge of his more secret obligations to God and his neighbor. Within this strophe, vers. 24-28 constitute first of all *one* adjuration by itself, consisting of three antecedents with אִם, to which ver. 28 is related as a common consequent. (According to the assumption of Ewald, Dillmann, Hahn, *etc.*, that ver. 28 is only a parenthesis, and that a consequent does not follow within the present strophe, the discourse would be too clumsy). Job here expresses his detestation of two new species of sins: avarice (vers. 24-25), and the idolatry of the Sabian astrology, which are here closely united together as the worship of the glittering metal, and that of the glittering stars; comp. Col. iii. 5.

Ver. 24. **If I set up gold for my confidence,** *etc.* On "gold" and "fine gold" comp. ch. xxviii. 16; on כֶּסֶל and מִבְטָח, ch. viii. 14. Respecting the masc. כַּבִּיר used as a neuter in ver. 25 *b*, of that which is great, considerable in number or amount, comp. Ew., § 172, *b*.

Ver. 26. **If I saw the sunlight** (אוֹר, "the light" simply, or "the light of this world," John xi. 9; used also of the sun in ch. xxxvii. 21; Hab. iii. 4; comp. the Greek *φάος*, *Odyss.* III. 355, and often), **how it shines** (כִּי as in ch. xxii. 12), **and the moon walking in splendor.** יָקָר a prefixed accus. of nearer specification to הֹלֵךְ hence used as an adverb, *splendide* (Ewald, § 279, *a*). ["יָרֵחַ is the moon as a wanderer (from רח—ארח) *i. e.*, night-wanderer, *noctivaga*. . . . The two words יָקָר הֹלֵךְ describe with exceeding beauty the solemn majestic wandering of the moon." Del.]

Ver. 28. **And my heart was secretly beguiled, so that I threw to them** (to these stars, having reference to the heathen divinities represented by them, hence the צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם, Deut. iv. 19) **a kiss by the hand** (lit. "so that I touched—with a kiss—my hand to my mouth;" respecting this sign of *adoratio*, or *προσκύνησις*, comp. 1 Kings xix. 18; Hos. xiii. 2; also Plin. H. N XXVIII., 2, 5: *Inter adorandum dexteram ad osculum referimus et totum corpus circumagimus;* and Lucian *περὶ ὀρχήσεως*, who represents the worshippers of the rising sun in Western Asia and Greece as performing their devotion by kissing the hand (*τὴν χεῖρα κύσαντες*). In the case of Job it was the worship of the stars as practiced by the Aramæans and Arabians (the Himjarites in particular among the latter worshipping the sun and moon [*Urotal* and *Alilat*] as their chief divinities) which might from time to time present itself to him in the form of a temptation to apostatize from *one* invisible God; comp. L. Krehl, *Die Religion der vorislamitischen Araber*, 1863; L. Diestel, *Der monotheismus des ältesten Heidenthums, Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1860, p. 709 seq. Against Ewald's assumption that there is here an allusion to the Parsee worship of the sun, and that for that reason our

book could not have been written before the 7th Cent. B. C., it may be said, that the kissing of the hand does not appear in the Zoroastrian ritual of prayer, and also that the sun and moon are represented in the Avesta as genii created by Ahuramazda, and consequently not as being themselves gods to be worshipped. Equally arbitrary with this derivation of the passage from the Zend religion by Ewald, is Dillmann's assertion, that it was only from the time of King Ahaz, and still more under Manasseh, that the adoration of the "host of heaven" began properly to exercise a seductive influence on the people of Israel, and that it was only from that point on that it could be regarded as a sign of particular religious purity "that one had never, not even in secret, yielded to this temptation." As though our poet did not know perfectly well what traits he ought to introduce into the picture of his hero, who is consistently represented as belonging to the patriarchal age! Comp. against this unnecessary assumption of an anachronism, of which the poet had been guilty, in the history of civilization or religion, the Introduction, § 6, II., *f.*

Ver. 28. Consequent (see above): **This also were a crime to be punished**; lit. "a judicial crime, one belonging to the judge;" comp. on ver. 11; and respecting the thought, Ex. xvii. 2 seq.—**Because I should have denied the God above** (ver. 2); lit. "I should have denied [acted falsely] in respect to the God above; כִּחֵשׁ לְ means here the same with כִּחֵשׁ בְּ elsewhere (ch. viii. 18; Is. lix. 13).

Vers. 29, 30. A new asseveration with an oath repudiating the suspicion that he had exhibited toward his enemies any hate or malice. For this hypothetic antecedent, as well as for all those which follow, beginning with אִם down to ver. 38, the special consequent is wanting; not until ver. 38 seq. does this series of *antapodota* [antecedents or protases] reach its end. The consequent in ver. 40, however, is, in respect of its contents, suited only to the antecedent passage immediately preceding, in vers. 38, 39, and not also to the verses preceding those.—Vers. 30, 32 and 35-37 are accordingly mere parentheses.—**If I rejoiced over** [or in] **the destruction** (פִּיד as in ch. xxx. 24) **of him that hated me.**—That the love of our enemies was already required as a duty under the Old Dispensation is shown by Ex. xxiii. 4; Lev. xix. 18 (the latter passage not without a characteristic limitation), but still more particularly by the Chokmah-literature, *e. g.* Prov. xx. 22; xxiv. 17 seq.; xxv. 21 seq.

Ver. 31. **Yet I did not** (וְלֹא with an adversative meaning for the copula) **allow my palate** (which is introduced here as the instrument of speech, as in ch. vi. 30 [where, however, it is rather the instrument of tasting, and so is used for the faculty of moral discrimination]) **to sin, by a curse to ask for his life**; *i. e.* by cursing to wish for his death.

Ver. 31 seq. He has also continually shown himself *generous* and *hospitable* towards his neighbor.—**If the people of my tent** (*i. e.* my household associates, my domestics) **were not obliged to say: where would there be one who has not been satisfied with his flesh?** lit. "who gives one not satisfied with his flesh?" מִי יִתֵּן as in ch. xiv. 4; נִשְׂבָּע, Partic. Niph. in the accus. depending on מִי יִתֵּן (comp. also ver. 35, and above ch. xxix. 2).—בְּשָׂרוֹ here means the same with טִבְחָתוֹ, 1 Sam. xxv. 11, the flesh of his slaughtered cattle. The figurative expression: "to eat any body's flesh" in the sense of backbiting, calumniating (ch. xix. 22) is not to be found here.

Ver. 32. **The stranger did not pass the night without; I opened my doors to the traveller.**—לָאֹרַח might of itself signify—"towards the street" (Stickel, Delitzsch). But since this qualification would be superfluous, אֹרַח is rather to be taken as=אִישׁ אֹרַח or אֹרֵחַ. As to the thought, comp. the accounts of the hospitality of Abraham at Mamre, of Lot at Sodom, of the old man at Gibeah (Gen. xviii. 19; comp. Heb. xiii. 2; Judg. xix. 15 seq.); also the many popular anecdotes among the Arabs of divine punishments inflicted on the inhospitable ("to open a guest-chamber" is in Arabic the same as to establish one's own household), and the eulogies of the hospitality of the departed in the Egyptian Book of the Dead. Comp. Wetzstein in Delitzsch [ii. 193], Brugsch, *Die egypt. Gräberwelt*, 1868, p. 32 seq.; L. Stern, *Das egypt. Todtengericht*, in "*Ausland*," 1870, p. 1081 seq.

12. *Conclusion: Fifth Strophe:* vers. 33-40.—Job is not consciously guilty even of the hypocritical concealment of his sins, nor of secret misdeeds—a final series of asseverations, which is not only related to the preceding enumeration (as though the same were incomplete, and might be supposed to have been silent in regard to some of Job's transgressions), but which simply links itself to all the preceding assertions of his innocence, and concludes the same.

Ver. 33. **If I covered after the manner of men my wickedness**; כָּאָדָם, after the way of the world, as people generally do; comp. Ps. lxxxii. 7 and Hos. vi. 7; for even in the latter passage this explanation is more natural than that which implies a reference to Gen. iii. 8: "as Adam (Targum, Schult., Rosenm., Hitzig, Umbr., v. Hofm., Del.) [E. V., Good, Lee, Con., Schlott., Words., Carey, *etc.;* and comp. Pusey on Hos. vi. 7. Conant observes of the rendering *ut homo* that "there is little force in this. On the contrary there is pertinency and point in the reference to a striking and well-known example of this offense, as a notable illustration of its guilt." Such a reference to primeval history in a book that belongs to the literature of the Chokmah is, as Delitzsch remarks, not at all surprising. And certainly the extra-Israelitish cast of the book is no objection to the recognition of so widely prevalent a tradition as that of the Fall in the monotheistic East.]—**Hiding** (לִטְמוֹן, Ew. § 280, *d*) **in my bosom my iniquity.**—חֹב is a poetic equivalent of חֵיק, found only here (but much more common in Aram.).

Ver. 34, closely connected with the preceding

verse, declares the motive which might have influenced Job to hide his sins, *viz.* the fear of men.—**Because I feared the great multitude.**—הָמוֹן here as fem., comp. Ew. § 174, *b;* עָרַץ here (otherwise than in ch. xiii. 25) intransitive "to be afraid," with accus. of the thing feared. On *b* and *c* comp. ch. xxiv. 16. The "tribes" [מִשְׁפָּחוֹת] whose contempt he fears (בּוּז as in ch. xii. 5, 21) are the nobler families, his own peers in rank, to be excluded from social intercourse with whom because of infamous crimes would cause him apprehension. With his "holding his peace," and "not going forth at his door" (in *c*)—signs betraying an evil conscience, Brentius strikingly compares the example of Demosthenes, who (according to Plutarch, *Demosth.* 25) on one occasion made a sore throat a pretext for not speaking, whereas in truth he had been bribed, and who was put to the blush by an exclamation from one of the people: "He is not suffering from a sore throat, but from a sore purse (*οὐχ ὑπὸ συνάγχης ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀργυράγχης εἰλῆφθαι*). [E. V. renders the verse interrogatively: "did I fear?" *etc.; i. e.* "if I covered my transgression, *etc.*, was it because I feared the multitude?" The objection to this rendering, however, is that it is less in harmony with the adjuratory tone of the context. Not a few commentators render this verse as the imprecation corresponding to ver. 22: "Then let me dread the great assembly," *etc.* So Schultens, Con., Noyes, Wemyss, Carey, Good, Lee, Barnes, Elzas.—(Patrick makes 34 *c* the apodosis: "Then let me hold my peace, and go not forth," *etc.*). It seems more natural however to regard the "dread of the great assembly," and the contempt of the great families of the land, as *causes* of the cowardly hypocrisy of ver. 33, rather than as its consequences.—Moreover, what the discourse loses as regards completeness of structure, it gains in impressiveness and energy by the frequent parentheses and breaks, which characterize this final strophe according to the view taken in the comm., and adopted by Ewald, Dillmann, Delitzsch, Schlottm., Rodwell, Wordsworth, Renan.—E.]

Vers. 35-37. The longest of the parentheses which interrupt the asseverations of our chapter, a shorter parenthesis being again incorporated even with this (ver. 35 *b*).—**O that I had one who would hear me!** to wit, in this assertion of my innocence. In this exclamation, as also in the following Job has *God* in view, for whose judicial interposition in his behalf he accordingly longs here again (as previously, ch. xiii. and xvi. seq.)—**Behold my signature** (lit. "my sign")—**let the Almighty answer me.**—The meaning of this exclamation which finds its way into this tumult of feeling can only be this: "There is the document of my defense, with my signature! Here I present my written vindication—let the Almighty examine it (comp. ver. 6), and deliver His sentence!" תָּוִי means lit. "my mark, my signature" [not "my desire," (E. V., after Targ. and Vulg.), as though it were connected with תאוה]; comp. the commentators on Ezek. ix. 4.—The cross-form of this sign (ת = †), which has there a typical significance, would have no significance in this passage. Rather is it the case that *Tav* here, in accordance with a conventional, proverbial way of speaking (as tiwa among the Arabs signifies any branded sign, whether or not it be precisely in the form of a cross), has acquired by synedoche the meaning—"a written document with signature attached, a writing subscribed, and for that reason legally valid;" and that Job means by this writing *all that he has hitherto said in his own justification*, the sum total of his foregoing asseverations of innocence, that it is therefore an *apologetic document*, a judicial vindication, to which he refers by this little word תו—this appears from the contrast with the accusation or indictment of his opponent, which is immediately mentioned in *c*. The supposition that Job was ignorant of writing, and for that reason was compelled to put a simple † for his signature can be inferred from the passage only by an inappropriate perversion of the proverbial and figurative meaning of the language. Moreover ch. xix. 23 seq. can be made to lend only an apparent support to this supposition.—**And** (that I had) **the writing which mine adversary has written!**—Grammatically this third member—וספר וגו׳—is connected with the first as a second accus. to מִי יִתֵּן; but according to its logical import, it is conditioned by the second member; or, which is the same thing, *b* is simply a grammatical parenthesis, but at the same time it serves to advance the thought. The "writing of the adversary" can only be the written charge, in which Job's adversary, *i. e.*, God (not the three friends, as Delitzsch explains, against the context) has laid down and fixed upon against him. This charge of God's he wishes to see over against his written defense, for which he is at once ready, or rather which he has already actually prepared. Most earnestly does he yearn to know what God, whom he must otherwise hold for a persecutor of innocence, really has against him. It is only from this interpretation of the words (adopted by Ew., Hirz., Heiligst., Vaih., Dillm.) [Schlott., Noy., Car., Con., Rodw., Bar., Lee, all agreeing as to sense, but with slight variations as to construction] that any available sense is obtained,—not from taking the third member as dependent on הֵן in the second, in which case סֵפֶר must denote either the "witness of God to Job's innocence written in his consciousness" (Hahn, and similarly Arnh., Stickel), or the charge preferred against Job by Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar (Del.) neither of which explanations is suitable, for the following verses show that Job is here speaking of something which he does not yet have, but only wishes for.—In respect to the use of writing, which is here again presupposed in judicial proceedings, comp. on ch. xiii. 26.

Vers. 36, 37 declare what Job would do with that charge of his divine adversary, for which he here longs; he would wear it as a trophy, or as a distinguishing badge of honor "on his shoulders" (comp. Isa. ix. 5, xxii. 22), and bind it around as an ornament for his head, lit., "as crowns," *i. e.*, as a crown consisting of diadems rising each out of the other (עֲטָרוֹת—comp. Rev. xix. 12);—comp. on the one side ch. xxix. 14; Isa. lxi. 10; on the other side Col. ii. 14 (the

handwriting which was blotted out by Christ through His being lifted up on the cross).—And further: **The number of my steps would I declare to Him**; *i. e.*, before Him, the Divine Adversary (who however is at the same time conceived of as Judge, as in ch. xvi. 21) would I conceal none of my actions, but rather would I courageously confess all to Him (הִגִּיד as in Ps. xxxviii. 19; respecting the construction with a double accus., comp. above ch. xxvi. 4).—**Like a prince would I draw near to Him**; *i. e*, draw nigh to Him with a firm stately step (קֵרֵב intens. of Kal, comp. Ezek. xxxvi. 8), as becomes a prince, not an accused person conscious of guilt; hence with a princely free and proud consciousness, not with that of a poor sinner.

Vers. 38-40 follow up the general assertion, that his conscience was not burdened with secret sins, with a more particular example of his freedom from covert blood-guiltiness. He knows himself to be innocent in particular of the wickedness of removing boundaries by violence, and of the heaven-crying guilt of secret murder, such as he might possibly have committed (after Ahab's example, 1 Kings xxi. 1 seq.; comp. above ch. xxiv. 2; Isa. v. 8) in order to acquire a piece of land belonging to a weaker neighbor. That Job should close this series of asseverations of innocence with the mention of so heinous a crime will appear strange only so long as we do not realize just how his opponents thus far had judged in respect to the nature and occasion of his suffering in consequence of their narrow-minded, external theory of retribution. Their judgment indisputably was—and Eliphaz had once, at least, expressed it very openly and decidedly (see ch. xxii. 6-9):—Because Job has to endure such extraordinary suffering, it must be that he is burdened with some *grievous* sin, some old secret bloody deed of murder, rapine, *etc.!* It is into this way of thinking of theirs that Job enters when he concludes his answer with the mention of just such a case, one which might seem sufficiently probable according to a human estimate of the circumstances, and so intentionally reserves to the end the solemn repudiation of that suspicion, which might very easily cleave to him, and which, if well-founded, must have affected him most destructively. The whole discourse—which indeed in its last division (ch. xxxi.) is essentially a self-vindication of the harshly and grievously accused sufferer—thus acquires an emphatic ending, which by the significant assonances that occur in the closing imprecation, ver. 40, reaches a very high degree of impressiveness, and produces a thrilling effect on those who heard and read it. This rhetorical artistic design in the close of the discourse is ignored, whether (with Hirzel and Heiligst.) we assume that it was the poet's purpose, that Job's discourse, which with ver. 38 seq., had taken a new start in further continuation of the series of asseverations touching his innocence, should seem to be interrupted by the sudden appearance of Jehovah (ch. xxxviii.), which takes place with striking effect (comp. Introd., § 10, No. 1, and *ad.* 1); or assume a transposition of vers. 38-40 out of their original connection, as was done by the Capuchin Bolducius (1637), who would remove the three verses back so as to follow ver. 8; by Kennicott and Eichhorn, who would place them after ver. 25; by Stuhlmann, who assigned their position before ver. 35, and latterly by Delitzsch, who leaves undetermined the place, where they originally belonged.

Ver. 38. **If my field cries out concerning me** (for vengeance, on account of the wicked treatment of its owner; comp. ch. xvi. 18; Hab. ii. 11), **and all together its furrows weep** (a striking poetic representation of the figure of crying out against one).

Ver. 39. **If I have eaten its strength** (*i. e.* its fruit, its products. comp. Gen. iv. 12) **without payment, and have blown out the soul of its owner**, *i. e.* by any kind of violence, by direct or indirect murder, have "caused him to expire;" comp. ch. xi. 20; and the proverbial saying: "to snuff out the candle of one's life."

Ver. 40. Consequent, and emphatic close: **Briars must** (then) **spring up** (for me) **instead of wheat, and stinking weeds instead of barley** (the strong word בָּאְשָׁה only here, "odious weeds, darnel"). As to meaning, ver. 8 is similar; but the present formula of imprecation is incomparably harsher and stronger than that former one, as is shown by the doubled assonance, first the alliteration חטה and חוח, and then the rhyme שְׂעֹרָה and בָאְשָׁה.—The short clause: "the words of Job are ended," which the Masoretes have inappropriately drawn into the network of the poetic accentuation, could scarcely have proceeded from the poet himself (as Carey and Hahn think, of whom the former is inclined even to regard them as Job's own final *dixi*), but stand on the same plane of critical value, and even of antiquity with the inscription at the end of the second book of Psalms (Ps. lxxii. 64), or with the closing words of Jer. li. 64. The LXX. have changed the words to *καὶ ἐπαύσατο Ἰὼβ ῥήμασιν*, in order to bring them into connection with the historical introductory verses in prose which follow (ch. xxxii.). But according to their Hebrew construction they do not seem to incline at all to such a connection. Jerome already recognized their character as an annotation of later origin; they found their way into his translation only by subsequent interpolation.—All Heb. MSS. indeed, as well as the ancient oriental versions (Targ., Pesh, *etc*), exhibit the addition, which must be accordingly of very high antiquity.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Measured by the Old Testament standard, the height of the moral consciousness which Job occupies in this splendid final monologue deserves our wonder, and is even incomparable. He says much, and says it boldly, in behalf of the purity of his heart and life. He affirms this with such ardor and fulness of expression, that at times he seems to forget himself, and to contradict his former confessions touching his participation in the universal depravity of the race, as found in ch. xiii. 26; xiv. 4 (see *e. g.* ch. xxix. 14; xxxi. 5-7, 35 seq.). He even relapses at one time into that tone of presumptuous accusation of God as

the merciless persecutor of innocence, and seems to find the only divine motive for his grievous lot to be a supposed pleasure by God in the infliction of torture, a one-sided exercise of His activity as a God of power, without any co-operation from His righteousness and love (ch. xxx., especially ver. 11 seq., 18, 20 seq.). But if in this there is to be recognized a remainder of the unsubdued presumption of the natural man in him, and a lack of proper depth, sharpness and clearness in his consciousness of sin, such as is possible only under the New Dispensation, he occupies a high place notwithstanding in the roll of Old Testament saints. He appears still, and that even in the protestation of innocence which he makes in his own behalf in this his last discourse, as a genuine prince in the midst of the heroes of faith and spiritual worthies of the time before Christ, as one who, when he suffered, had the right to be regarded as an innocent sufferer, and to meet with indignation every suspicion which implied that he was making expiation for secret sins, as the wicked must do.

2. This moral exaltation of Job is seen already in the way in which in ch. xxix. he describes his former prosperity. Among all the good things of the past which he longs to have back, he gives the pre-eminence to the fellowship and blessing of God, the fountain of all other good (ver. 2 seq). In describing the distinguished estimation in which he was then held among men, it is not the external honor as such which he makes most prominent, but the beneficent influence, which, by virtue of that distinction he was able to exert, the works of love, of righteousness and of mercy, in which he was then able to seek and to find his happiness, as the father and guide of many (ch. xxix. 12-17). In the midst of his bitterest complaints on account of the greatness of his losses and the depth of his misery, there come groanings that he can no more do as he was wont to do—weep with the distressed, and mourn with the needy, in order to bring them comfort, counsel and help (ch. xxx. 25). And what a noble horror of the sins of falsehood, of lying and deception, of adulterous unchastity, of cruelty towards servants and all those needing help in any way, sounds forth through the asseverations of his innocence in the 31st chapter! With what penetrative truth and beauty does he grasp the two forms of idolatry, the worship of gold on the part of the avaricious, and the worship of the stars by the superstitious heathen, as two ways—only in appearance far removed from each other, but in truth most closely united together—of denying the *one* true and living God (vers. 24-28)! How decidedly he maintains the necessity of showing love even to one's enemies, to say nothing of one's fellow-men in general, known or unknown, neighbors or foreigners (ver. 29 seq.)! With what indignation does he repel the suspicion of secret, hypocritically concealed sins and deeds of violence, again solemnly appealing in the same connection to God to be a witness to the purity of his conscience and to be a judge of the innocence of his heart (ver. 33 seq.)! The man who could thus bear witness to his innocence could be a virtuous man of no ordinary sort. He was far from being one of the common class of righteous men known in ancient times. Such an one, far from being subject to the curse of wicked slander and calumny, could not be reckoned among ordinary sinners, or as a crafty hypocrite.

3. That, however, which exalts Job higher than all this is that which is said by him in the beginning of ch. xxxi. (ver. 1 seq.; comp. ver. 7) *in respect to his avoidance on principle even of all sins of thought, and impure lusts of the heart.* "A covenant have I made for my eyes, and how should I fix my gaze on a maiden?" He who shows such earnestness as this in obeying the law of chastity, in avoiding all sinful lust, in extirpating even the slightest germs of sin in the play of thought, and in the look of the eyes—he strives after a holiness which is in fact better and more complete than the law of the Old Dispensation, with its prohibitions of coveting that which belongs to another (Ex. xx. 17; Deut. v. 21), could teach. He shows himself to be on the way which leads directly to that pure as well as complete righteousness and godlikeness, which has for its final aim purity of heart as the foundation and condition of one day beholding God, and which, in its activity towards men, takes the form of that perfect love which seeks nothing but good and blessing even for enemies, and devotes itself wholly and unreservedly to the kingdom of God—on the way, in short, to that holiness and purity of heart which Christ teaches and prescribes in the Sermon on the Mount. The fact that Job gives utterance to such high and clear conceptions of rectitude, virtue and holiness, is of especial interest for the reason that not one of the fundamental principles recognized by him is referred expressly to the Sinaitic law; but, on the contrary, the extra-Israelitish pre-Mosaic patriarchal character of his religious and ethical consciousness and activity is preserved throughout, and with conscious consistency by the poet in the description before us (comp. above on ch. xxxi. 24-27). In the strict accuracy with which this representation mirrors the characteristic features of the inner, as well as of the outer life of the patriarchal age, and in the fidelity with which the East cherishes and preserves the traditions of the primeval world in general, these utterances of a man who survived in the recollections of posterity as a moral pattern of the *ætas patriarcharum*, acquire indirectly even an *apologetic importance* which is not insignificant, in so far as it proves the impossibility of conceiving historically of the moral civilization of the patriarchs otherwise than as resting on the foundation of positive revelation. Comp. Delitzsch [II. 172 seq.]: "Job is not an Israelite, he is without the pale of the positive, Sinaitic revelation; his religion is the old patriarchal religion, which even in the present day is called *din Ibrahim* (the religion of Abraham, or *din el-bedu* (the religion of the steppe) as the religion of those Arabs who are not Moslem, or at least influenced by the penetrating Islamism, and is called by Mejânîshî *el hanîfîje*, as the patriarchally orthodox religion. As little as this religion, even in the present day, is acquainted with the specific Mohammedan commandments, so little knew Job of the specifically Israelitish. On the contrary,

his confession, which he lays down in this third monologue, coincides remarkably with the ten commandments of piety (*el-felâh*) peculiar to the *dîn Ibrahîm*, although it differs in this respect, that it does not give the prominence to submission to the dispensations of God, that *teslîm* which, as the whole of this didactic poem teaches by its issue is the study of the perfectly pious; also bravery in defense of holy property and rights is wanting, which among the wandering tribes is accounted as an essential part of the *hebbet er-rîh* (inspiration of the Divine Being) *i. e.* active piety, and to which it is similarly related, as to the binding notion of 'honor' which was coined by the western chivalry of the middle ages. Job begins with the duty of chastity. Consistently with the prologue, which the drama itself nowhere belies, he is living in monogamy, as at the present day the orthodox Arabs, averse to Islamism, are not addicted to Moslem polygamy. With the confession of having maintained this marriage (although, to infer from the prologue, it was not an over-happy, deeply sympathetic one) sacred, and restrained himself not only from every adulterous act, but also from adulterous desires, his confessions begin. Here, in the middle of the Old Testament, without the pale of the Old Testament νόμος, we meet just that moral strictness and depth, with which the Preacher on the Mount (Matt. v. 27 seq.) opposes the spirit to the letter of the seventh commandment." As Biblical parallels to the strict observance of the law of monogamic chastity in the patriarchal age, as the passage before us affirms it of Job, may be mentioned Isaac and Joseph, as also Moses and Aaron.

4. The fact that Job towards the end of his monologue (not quite at the end of it—see above on ch. xxxi. 38 seq.) repeats his previously uttered wish for a judicial interposition of God in his behalf is significant in so far as in this demand the triumph of his consciousness of innocence, by virtue of which he knows that he is secured against all dangers of defeat, expresses itself most strongly and clearly; and in this same connection the practical goal of his apologetic testimony hitherto is evident in his pressing on to the conclusion of the entire action. This conclusion of the action does not indeed follow immediately, inasmuch as a human teacher of wisdom next makes his appearance as the harbinger of Jehovah's appearance,—preparing the way for it. This however takes place exactly in the way, and with the result which Job himself has wished and hoped for—the trial to which God finally condescends at Job's repeated request, being such as yields for its result not a clean victory for Job, but rather a thorough humiliation of the pride and presumption, hitherto unknown to himself. But even this incongruity between Job's desire and the way in which God grants it, corresponds perfectly to the poet's plan, and is a most brilliant evidence of the purity and loftiness of his religious and moral way of thinking, in which *a conscience so wonderfully delicate and enlightened as that which Job had disclosed in these his closing discourses nevertheless appears as in need of repentance, and unable to secure from God a verdict of unconditional justification.* In like manner as Christ declared to that young man who boasted that he had kept all the commandments of the law from his youth up, that one thing was lacking, even to give up all his earthly possessions, and to secure an imperishable treasure in heaven (Mark xviii. 21, and the parallel passages), our poet first introduces Elihu, as a representative of the highest that human wisdom can teach and accomplish apart from a divine revelation, and then the revealing voice of God Himself, crying out to his hero a humiliating—"One thing thou lackest!" This one thing which Job yet lacked in order to be acknowledged by God as His well-beloved servant, and to be received again into His favor, is to humble himself beneath God's mighty hand, willingly to accept all His dispensations as wise, gracious, and just, to be thoroughly delivered from that sinful self-exaltation, in which he had dared to find fault with God, and to be enraged against His alleged severity. This was the last thing belonging to him which he must give up, the last remnant of earthly impure dross, from which the gold of his heart must be set free, in order that he might become partaker of the divine grace of justification. In order really and completely to comprehend the divine wisdom, which in ch. xxviii. he had so strikingly described as a precious treasure in heaven transcending all earthly jewels, in order actually to travel the hidden way to her, with that accurate knowledge of it which he had there portrayed, this one thing was still lacking to him:—the humble acknowledgment that even in his case God had acted altogether justly, altogether lovingly, altogether as a Father. To the possession of this *one* precious pearl he was led forward by Elihu and Jehovah through the two remaining stages in the solution of the problem.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

In unfolding the rich contents of the three preceding chapters according to their connection with the entire structure of the poem, and in assigning to these contents their true position in the inner progress of the action, it will be well to bestow special attention on the parallel just now indicated (Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks, No. 4) between *Job and the rich young man.* Job, earnestly and honestly striving after the kingdom of God, after an eternal fellowship of the life with God, with this in view receiving and enumerating all the moral treasures of his spirit and of his life, who notwithstanding his wealth in such treasures is discovered to be not yet just before God;—or, more briefly: Job, the Old Testament seeker after happiness, contemplating himself in the mirror of the law (Job, the prototype of that rich man, to whose perfection one thing was yet lacking);—such might be the statement of the theme of a comprehensive meditation on the material before us, according to its relations to that which precedes, and to that which follows. The length of the discourse indeed would necessitate a division into several parts, of which any *one* could not very well exceed the limits of one of the three chapters. The practical expositor will find the richest yield of fruitful hortatory motives in the two bright pic-

tures which constitute the opening and the close of the long soliloquy (ch. xxix. and xxxi.), whereas the gloomy night-piece which they enclose (ch. xxx.) seems in this respect relatively poor, and when compared with the similar descriptive lamentations in Job's previous discourses, exhibits scarcely anything that is essentially new.

Particular Passages.

Ch. xxix. 2 seq. COCCEIUS: Job indeed in this place seems not so much to desire his former happiness, as to contrast the pleasure of a good conscience and of a friendship with God formed in youth, with his present fearful sufferings. . . He wishes for his former condition, adorned as it was with tokens of divine favor, not for the sake of those tokens, to wit, plenteousness and sweetness of life, but for the sake of that of which they were the seal. . . He distinguishes between his own chief good, and the things connected with it. . . . . He brings forward his riches as a testimony of the past, not as a necessity of the present. For he knew that even a beggar can delight in God.—V. GERLACH: That which constitutes the kernel of the description here again is the constant nearness of God, the consciousness of His approbation, the certainty of His guidance; this is accompanied by the happy recollection that he had employed the honor which God had granted to him, the riches which He had bestowed on him, only to bless others: in short his position was that of a princely, royal representative of God on earth.

Ch. xxix. 18 seq. CRAMER: On earth there is nothing that endures; if it goes well with any one, let him suspect that it may go ill with him (Sir. ii. 26).—V. GERLACH: In Job's allusion to the ancient legend of the phœnix, there lies a certain irony: I had hoped in respect to the permanence of my happiness that which was most incredible, most impossible, *etc.*

Ch. xxx. 1 seq. BRENTIUS: From all these things (enumerated in the preceding chapter), Job's authority is eulogized, that we may learn with what honor God sometimes distinguishes the pious. But in this chapter we are taught with what a cross He afflicts them that they may be tried; for it behooves the godly to be proved on the right hand and on the left, as Paul says 2 Cor. vi. 7 (comp. Phil. iv. 12). But this is written for our instruction, that we may learn that nothing in the whole world, however excellent, endures, but that all things go to ruin; for both the heavens and the earth will perish, how much more carnal glory, authority and happiness (Is. xl.).—IDEM (on ver. 12): Temptation is two-fold, on the right hand, and on the left. We are tempted on the right when fleshly joys, health, riches, majesty, glory abound—a temptation which, as it is most agreeable to the flesh, so also is it most dangerous. . . . . We are tempted on the left by crosses, afflictions and evils of whatever sort, more safely, however, and with less danger, for we are more readily taught by the cross than destroyed by it.—ZEYSS: To be the objects of extreme contempt and ridicule from the world is to pious believers a great tribulation, and inflicts deep wounds on their hearts, but even in this they must become like Christ their head (Heb. xii. 3)!—IDEM (on ver. 15): When God afflicts His children in the body, or by some other grievous outward calamity, this is seldom unaccompanied by inward trials, anguish, fear and terror; it is with them, as with the Apostle—without fightings, within fears (2 Cor. vii. 5).

Ch. xxxi. 1 seq. OECOLAMPADIUS: He sets before our eyes one who is absolutely righteous in every particular; for a man will not escape the wrath of God, if he is merciful to the wretched, while at the same time he pollutes himself with various lusts and crimes. He accordingly indulges in holy boasting that he had been blameless in the law, that he had kept his members from abominable sins, and devoted himself to the service of righteousness, keeping his eyes from lusting after a woman, his tongue from guile and falsehood, his hands and feet from cruelty, violence, revenge and rapacity. For he who puts such a watch upon his senses, he will easily be perfected in all things.—STARKE: Forasmuch as it is through the eyes, for the most part, that whatsoever excites the lust finds its way into the heart, Job naturally begins with his watchfulness over this sense; from which it may be seen that he understood the divine law far better than the Pharisees in the time of Christ (Matt. v. 27 seq.).

Ver. 16 seq. STARKE: He who does good to the poor will not remain unblessed (Ps. xli. 2 [1] seq.). Clothing the naked is a deed of mercy (Is. lviii. 7 seq.) which Christ will hereafter praise on the last day (Matt. xxv. 36).

Ver. 24 seq. OECOLAMPADIUS: See what a chain of virtues he links together, and what innocence he preserves through all things! It is not those only who acquire riches by plunder and lawlessness who incur God's wrath, but those even who trust in riches honestly acquired, and who prefer them to God, so that they become their idol and their mammon. . . . The pious and grateful man would say: I have received from God; but they whose God is gold, have no God.—STARKE: It was a proof of great constancy on the part of Job to serve the true God faithfully in the midst of idolaters, and to be most solicitous to show the more subtle idolatry of avarice as well as the more gross idolatry of sun and stars.

Ver. 35 seq. OSIANDER: Even godly people have flesh and blood, and often say things of which they must afterwards repent, and which they themselves cannot praise.—WOHLFARTH: "I will, I can render an account before the Lord"—thus speaks Job in the consciousness that he has never committed a gross sin—nay, has even shunned most carefully the minor and more secret offenses. Was he, however, quite so sure of this? Was he in truth so absolutely blameless before God, to whom we must confess: "Lord, when I have done all things, I am still an unprofitable servant! Who can mark the number of his transgressions?" *etc.* There belongs in truth more to this than a man generally believes when he calls God as a witness.

The Second Stage of the Disentanglement.

CHAPTER XXXII.—XXXVII.

Elihu's Discourses, devoted to proving that there can be really no undeserved suffering, that on the contrary the sufferings decreed for those who are apparently righteous are dispensations of divine love, designed to purify and to sanctify them through chastisement: The first half of the positive solution of the problem.

INTRODUCTION: ELIHU'S APPEARANCE, AND THE EXORDIUM OF HIS DISCOURSE, GIVING THE REASONS FOR HIS SPEAKING.

CHAP. XXXII. 1—XXXIII. 7.

1. Elihu's appearance (related in prose).

CHAPTER XXXII. 1-6 *a*.

1 So these three men ceased to answer Job, because he was righteous in his own
2 eyes. Then was kindled the wrath of Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite, of the
kindred of Ram; against Job was his wrath kindled, because he justified himself
3 rather than God. Also against his three friends was his wrath kindled, because
4 they had found no answer, and yet had condemned Job. Now Elihu had waited
5 till Job had spoken, because they were elder than he. When Elihu saw that there
6 was no answer in the mouth of these three men, then his wrath was kindled. And
Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite answered and said:

2. An explanation addressed to the previous speakers, showing why he had taken part in their controversy: vers. 6-10.

6 *b* I am young, and ye are very old;
wherefore I was afraid,
and durst not show you mine opinion.
7 I said, Days should speak,
and multitude of years should teach wisdom.
8 But there is a spirit in man;
and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.
9 Great men are not always wise;
neither do the aged understand judgment.
10 Therefore I said, Hearken to me;
I also will show mine opinion.

3. Setting forth that he was justified in taking part, because the friends had showed, and still showed themselves unable to refute Job: vers. 11-22.

11 Behold, I waited for your words;
I gave ear to your reasons,
whilst ye searched out what to say.
12 Yea, I attended unto you,
and behold, there was none of you that convinced Job,
or that answered his words.
13 Lest ye should say: "We have found out wisdom:
God thrusteth him down, not man."
14 Now he hath not directed his words against me;
neither will I answer him with your speeches.

15 They were amazed, they answered no more:
they left off speaking.
16 When I had waited (for they spake not,
but stood still, and answered no more);
17 I said, I will answer also my part,
I also will show mine opinion.
18 For I am full of matter,
the spirit within me constraineth me.
19 Behold, my belly is as wine which hath no vent,
it is ready to burst like new bottles.
20 I will speak, that I may be refreshed:
I will open my lips and answer.
21 Let me not, I pray you, accept any man's person,
neither let me give flattering titles unto man.
22 For I know not to give flattering titles:
in so doing my Maker would soon take me away.

4. A special appeal to Job to listen calmly to him [Elihu], as a mild judge of his guilt and weakness: chap. xxxiii. 1-7.

1 Wherefore, Job, I pray thee, hear my speeches,
and hearken to all my words.
2 Behold, now I have opened my mouth,
my tongue hath spoken in my mouth.
3 My words shall be of the uprightness of my heart;
and my lips shall utter knowledge clearly.
4 The Spirit of God hath made me,
and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life.
5 If thou canst answer me,
set thy words in order before me, stand up.
6 Behold, I am according to thy wish in God's stead:
I also am formed out of the clay.
7 Behold, my terror shall not make thee afraid,
neither shall my hand be heavy upon thee.

FIRST DISCOURSE: OF MAN'S GUILT BEFORE GOD.

Chap. XXXIII. 8–33.

a. Preparatory: Reproof of Job's confidence in his entire innocence: vers. 8-11.

8 Surely thou hast spoken in mine hearing,
and I have heard the voice of thy words, saying:
9 I am clean without transgression,
I am innocent, neither is there iniquity in me.
10 Behold, He findeth occasions against me,
He counteth me for His enemy:
11 He putteth my feet in the stocks,
He marketh all my paths.

b. Didactic discussion of the true relation of sinful men to God, who seeks to warn and to save them by manifold dispensations and communications from above: vers. 12-30.

12 Behold, in this thou art not just:
I will answer thee, that God is greater than man.
13 Why dost thou strive against Him?
for He giveth not account of any of His matters.
14 For God speaketh once, yea twice,
yet man perceiveth it not.

15 In a dream, in a vision of the night,
when deep sleep falleth upon men,
in slumberings upon the bed;
16 then He openeth the ears of men,
and sealeth their instruction,
17 that He may withdraw man from his purpose,
and hide pride from man.
18 He keepeth back his soul from the pit,
and his life from perishing by the sword.

19 He is chastened also with pain upon his bed,
and the multitude of his bones with strong pain:
20 so that his life abhorreth bread,
and his soul dainty meat.
21 His flesh is consumed away, that it cannot be seen;
and his bones that were not seen stick out.
22 Yea, his soul draweth near unto the grave,
and his life to the destroyers.

23 If there be a messenger with him,
an interpreter, one among a thousand,
to show unto man his uprightness;
24 then He is gracious unto him, and saith,
Deliver him from going down to the pit:
I have found a ransom.
25 His flesh shall be fresher than a child's;
he shall return to the days of his youth:
26 he shall pray unto God, and He will be favorable unto him;
and he shall see His face with joy;
for He will render unto man His righteousness.
27 He looketh upon men, and if any say,
I have sinned, and perverted that which was right,
and it profited me not;
28 He will deliver his soul from going into the pit,
and his life shall see the light.

29 Lo, all these things worketh God
oftentimes with man,
30 to bring back his soul from the pit,
to be enlightened with the light of the living.

c. Conclusion: Calling upon Job to give an attentive hearing to the discourses by which he would further instruct him: vers. 31-33.

31 Mark well, O Job, hearken unto me;
hold thy peace, and I will speak.
32 If thou hast anything to say, answer me:
speak, for I desire to justify thee.
33 If not, hearken unto me:
hold thy peace, and I shall teach thee wisdom.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. On the general subject of the genuineness of Elihu's discourses, comp. Introd., § 10, as well as below, Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks.—The circumstantiality of the twofold introduction to these discourses—first that of the author in prose, then the self-introduction of Elihu (ch. xxxii. 6 *b*—xxxiii. 7) which latter again consists of three subdivisions—is to be explained by the fact that in Elihu there was to be introduced the representative of a new stand-point, which had not yet received its statement, differing as it did from that of all the former speakers. For neither Job's one-sided denial of his guilt nor the blunt and rough way in which he had been attacked, satisfies this new speaker. He appears to speak

for and *against* Job, whose "better self" he in some measure represents (comp. Victor Andreä, p. 139); hence the three stages of his self-introduction: (1) the *captatio benevolentiæ* with which he begins; or the apology for his youth addressed to all the former speakers (ch. xxxii. 6 *b*-10); (2) the reprimand administered to the three friends, as having shown themselves incompetent to refute Job (vers. 11-22);—and (3) the appeal to Job to give a hearing to his instructions (ch. xxxiii. 1-7) an appeal full of earnest admonition and loving encouragement. The last of these divisions provides a direct transition to the *first* of Elihu's discourses proper (ch. xxxiii. 8-33), in which he sets forth the foundation of Job's suffering—the universal sinfulness and guilt of men before God, this discourse again occupying three divisions, of which the middle, being the longest (vers. 12-30), contains the proper didactic exposition of the subject, while the first, by citing the propositions of Job which are to be refuted, prepares the way for the discussion; and the third furnishes, together with a practical conclusion, the transition to the didactic discourse which follows. The most of these divisions are at the same time coincident each with a single strophe, except that the long middle sections (ch. xxxii. 11-22 and ch. xxxiii. 12-30) are subdivided into several strophes, the former into two, the latter into four, together with a short epiphonema of two verses (vers. 29-30).

2. *Introduction in prose* (although with poetic accents—comp. above. § 3, p. 264) [the poetic mode of accentuation retained, because a change in the middle of the book, and especially in a piece of such small compass appeared awkward: Del.] ch. xxxii. 1–6 *a*.—**Then the three men ceased to answer Job.** This notification occurs first here, not after ch. xxvi. or ch. xxviii., because it was only through the last monologues of Job that the defeat of the three opponents became complete.—**Because he was righteous in his own eyes**; *i. e.*, because he would not admit that his suffering was in any degree whatever the consequence of his guilt; a statement which refers back in particular to the contents of ch. xxxi.

Ver. 2. **Then was kindled the wrath of Elihu, the son of Barachel,** *etc.* אֱלִיהוּא, which is written below without the final א (ch. xxxii. 4; xxxv. 1) signifies—"my God is he," and appears also as an Israelitish name (1 Sam. i. 1; 1 Chron. xii. 20). The Elihu of our passage is a Nahorite, of the tribe of Buz (בּוּז), who in Gen. xxii 21 is mentioned as the brother of Uz, and the second son of Nahor, and whose tribe, according to Jer. xxv. 23, like Dedan and Tema, belonged to the inhabitants of the Arabian desert. The "family of Ram" is mentioned only here. The identification of the name רָם with אֲרָם is inadmissible, for רָם is simply the name of a family, not of a people. The Aramaic origin of the Buzites, according to the above description, admits indeed of no doubt, and the same may be said respecting the poet's purpose in that connection to impart an Aramaic coloring to Elihu's discourses. Lightfoot and Rosenmüller curiously imagine that under the character of Elihu the poet has concealed *himself*, and that this explains the particularity with which, in opposition to what is characteristic of the book elsewhere, he describes the origin of the new speaker. This detailed account of Elihu's genealogy is undoubtedly a little singular, but it may be satisfactorily explained by the poet's desire to represent him as a kinsman of the same race with Job, or it may be his desire to distinguish between him and some other well-known person of the name. In respect to the question whether Elihu's position is that of "one not simply near to the Abrahamitic revelation, but of one standing within the pale of it" (as Vilmar thinks, *l. c.*), nothing definite can be established from the genealogical statement before us.—Respecting the name בָּרַכְאֵל (instead of which some MSS. write בָּרַכְאֵל, with a latent Daghesh), it signifies—"may God bless!" and is thus distinguished as an imperative formation from the indicative of the specifically Israelitish name בֶּרֶכְיָה ("Jehovah blesseth").—**Because he declared himself righteous before God.** צַדֵּק instead of the Hiph. which is elsewhere more common in this signification, occurs again ch. xxxiii. 32, and often in Jerem. and Ezek.—מֵאֱלֹהִים, not "more than God, at the expense of God" (Ew., Delitz.) [E. V., Con., Noy., Carey, Words., *etc.*], but "before," מִן accordingly as in ch. iv. 17. The comparison of the passage in ch. xl. 8 is scarcely sufficient to confirm the former rendering.

Ver. 3 states how far the conduct of the three friends had caused Elihu's discontent:—**because they found no answer, and still condemned Job.** So—taking וְ in וַיַּרְשִׁיעוּ adversatively—may the words be rendered with the greatest probability (so Hirzel, Ewald) [E. V., Noy., Con., Carey, Rodwell, Elz., Schlottm., Renan]. For the fact that the friends had condemned Job *notwithstanding* their inability to answer him aggravates the guilt of the three in Elihu's eyes; and that he really attributed to them double guilt, as compared with Job, is evident from the passage which follows, and which involves more rigid censure of the friends (ver. 11 seq.; 15 seq.) than of Job (comp. also ver. 5). With this interpretation agrees essentially that of Delitzsch and Kamphausen: "because they, from their inability to answer him, condemned him." ["The *fut. consec.* describes the condemnation as the result of their inability to hit upon the right answer; it was a miserable expedient to which they had recourse." Del.]. The language admits still further of the explanation of Hahn and Dillmann (with the influence of the negation extended to the second member): "because they did not find an answer, and (consequently) did not condemn him [*i. e.*, secure his condemnation, by "stripping him of his self-righteousness"]. The opinion of the Masoretes, that in this passage we have one of the 18 *Tiqquney Sopherim* (comp. on ch. vii. 20), according to which we should read אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים instead of אֶת־אִיּוֹב, is refuted by ch. xl. 8, where it is not the friends, but Job, who is said to have shown himself to be one who had condemned God.

Ver. 4. **But Elihu had waited for Job with words.**—חִכָּה pluperf., comp. Ewald, § 135, *a; i. e.*, he had waited until Job's speeches were ended, until he had spoken his last word in the controversy, the reason being:—**because they were older than he in days** (לְיָמִים, as in ch. xxx. 1, and below ver. 6), *i. e.*, because he was the youngest of all,—younger than all the former speakers.

3. *First section of Elihu's introduction: captatio benevolentiæ*, addressed to all the former speakers: vers. 6 *b*–10.—**Young am I in days, and ye are hoary** (יְשִׁישִׁים as in ch. xii. 12; xv. 10; xxix. 8); **therefore I was afraid and feared.** זחל in Heb. elsewhere "to crawl," here in the sense of "fearing," customary in Aramaic, but not met with elsewhere in the O. T. [Carey: "I did slink"]. Also דֵּעַ for דַּעַת is an expression peculiar to the Aramaizing constructions of Elihu's language (comp. again vers. 10, 17; ch. xxxvi. 3; xxxvii. 16), while on the contrary חִוָּה "to declare, to communicate," occurs elsewhere in our book. ["It becomes manifest even here that the Elihu section has in part a peculiar use of the language." Del.].

Ver. 7. Respecting the plur. יוֹדִיעוּ with רֹב שָׁנִים, comp. ch. xxi. 21.

Ver. 8. **Still the spirit it is in mortal man . . . which gives them understanding.** אָכֵן *verum*, only here by Elihu, instead of אוּלָם, which is elsewhere customary in this sense. The subjects רוּחַ וגו' and נִשְׁמַת וגו' have for their common predicate הִיא with תְּבִינֵם at the close of the second member as a relative clause of closer specification. The "spirit in man" is the principle of his life and thought wrought into him by the Spirit of God; here, as also in ch. xxvii. 3; xxxiii. 4; xxxiv. 14, identical with the "breath of the Almighty," the Divine creative breath (Gen. ii. 7); comp. also Eccl. xii. 7. [Noyes happily quotes the following from Milton, in the preface to his *Reason of Church Government, urged against Prelaty:* "And if any man think I undertake a task too difficult for my years, I trust, through the supreme enlightening assistance, far otherwise; for my years, be they few or many, what imports it? So they bring reason, let that be looked on"].—אֱנוֹשׁ is used collectively, as is evident from the plur. suffix in *b* referring to it.

Ver. 9. **Not the aged are wise**; lit. "not the great" (רַבִּים) [*grandævi*], *i. e.*, great in years, comp. the πολυχρόνιοι of the LXX., also Gen. xxv. 23; and צָעִיר, small = young, above (ver. 6 *b*).

Ver. 10. **Therefore I say: Hearken to me!**—The Imperfect singular, שִׁמְעָה־לִּי, is used distributively, applying to each individual of those who are summoned to hear, (not referring specially to Job, to whom Elihu does not address himself until below in ch. xxxiii. 1 seq.). The ancient versions, except the Targ., as well as some MSS. read שִׁמְעוּ—an emendation to relieve the difficulty [arising from El.'s addressing the friends in the plur. in the next verse]. **I also will declare my knowledge** (comp. ver. 6, *b*). [Rather, more modestly—"I will declare my knowledge, even I." Words.]. Respecting the appearance of vain self-praise, of which Elihu is guilty in consequence of these and the preceding expressions, comp. below Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks, No. 2.

4. *Second section of Elihu's introduction:* Showing his claims to speak, in contrast with the friends, as the feeble and incompetent opponents of Job: vers. 11-22.—*a.* Address to the friends touching their lack of skill in refuting Job. **Behold, I waited for your words**; or for words from you." דִּבְרֵיכֶם are not the words actually uttered by them (Stick., Hahn, Schlott.), but those for which Elihu had waited in vain, expecting that they would produce them, more particularly explained in *b* as being their words of *intelligence*, speeches full of wisdom (תְּבוּנוֹת). The construction of אָזִין, contracted form for אַאֲזִין) with עַד shows clearly enough that the object of the hearkening or listening was wholly in expectation. **Until ye might find out replies.** מִלִּין, a second parallel term to דברים, can denote here only words from the friends, suited to refute Job, such words as they had shown themselves unable to "search out," or "to think out." (חקר).

Ver. 12. **And unto you I gave heed.**—עֲדֵיכֶם means here אֲלֵיכֶם; or it may mean giving heed *until* they should produce a real confutation of Job. [Carey translates עַד the three times it occurs in vers. 10-11 "to the utmost of"—perhaps a little too artificially. It does however express more emphatically than the simple לְ the act of close attention.—E.].

Ver. 13. **That ye may not say**; or "since ye do not say, *etc.*"—Respecting the dissuasive particle פֶּן "that not," comp. Ew., § 337, *b*. **We found wisdom** (*i. e.*, with Job): **God can smite him, not man.**—That is, we have come upon such superior wisdom in Job that only God can drive him out of the field (נדף *discutere, dispellere*, used elsewhere of the chasing of chaff, straw, smoke—comp. Ps. i. 4; lxviii. 3 [2]) ["chosen here with great propriety, because after every answer from the three Job showed himself again in the arena." Dillm.]. Only this explanation, adopted by most moderns, gives a meaning that is intelligent, and suited to the context, not that of the ancient commentators (also more recently of Rosenmüller, Arnheim, Welte, *etc.*): "Only do not say we have brought up against him true wisdom, to wit: that God Himself contends against, and routs him out of the field (by the severe sufferings which He has decreed for him" [and so substantially Lee, Bernard. According to another explanation the second member is spoken by Elihu, not the friends, the general meaning being: Ye have been silenced, lest ye should become proud and boast of your wisdom, and that his defeat may come visibly from God and not from men. So Good, Wordsworth, Carey, Wemyss, Rodwell, Barnes, most of whom make the first

member dependent on the second; *e. g.* Rodwell: "Lest ye should say—'We have found out wisdom,'— El, not man, shall vanquish him."—Schlottmann explains: "*Say not: We have found wisdom, i. e.* we for our part have not erred, we have hit the exact truth, *but God must smite him, not man, i. e.* Job is so obstinate that the most exhaustive proofs of our doctrine fail to affect him, wherefore God only can convict him of his error."]

Ver. 14. **For he hath not arrayed words against me**; *i. e.* he has produced no argument which actually convinces me of his innocence. עָרַךְ *sensu forensi* as in ch. xiii. 18; xxiii. 4. The whole verse introduced by וְלֹא with a fin. verb following, forms a clause subordinate to that which precedes, like ch. xlii. 3 (comp. Ewald, § 341, *a*).

b. A declaration respecting the unavoidable necessity of his taking part in the colloquy, the friends although still referred to being spoken of in the third person.

Ver. 15. **They are confounded, they answer no more**, or "without answering again" (comp. Ewald, § 349, *a*), **words are fled away from them.** *i. e.* have deserted them; העתיק here accordingly intransitive; "to depart, to wander away," like Gen. xii. 8; xxvi. 22, not transitive, as in chap. ix. 5 (against Hirzel).

Ver. 16. **And should I (still) await, because they speak not?**—This interrogative rendering of the Perf. consec. וְהוֹחַלְתִּי is the only one that yields a suitable meaning, not the affirmative, which used to be the prevalent one, "and I waited, because," *etc.*, by which the verse would express a quite unendurable tautology with vers. 11, 12.

Ver. 17. **So then I also will answer my part**, *i. e.* what comes to my part (comp. ch. xv. 2; Prov. xviii. 23); I will in like manner throw the weight of my opinion into the scales. ["Elihu speaks more in the scholastic tone of controversy than the three." Delitzsch. The אַף־אָנִי twice repeated is far from implying conceit or arrogance on the part of the speaker. It is possible indeed to explain it, with Barnes, "*even* I," notwithstanding my youth and inexperience, in the tone of modest self-depreciation. More probably however it indicates rather the *independent, individual* position of the speaker, differing as it did from the rest, as we should say—"on my part." In any case, as Schultens remarks: *jucunda et decora formula; scire meum—quantum mihi quidem sciere, et percipere datum. Frustra sunt, qui hæc ad arrogantiam detorquent.*" E.] The Fut. Hiph., אַעֲנֶה, expresses as *e. g.* Eccles. v. 19 (see on the passage); Hos. ii. 23, *etc.*, the strengthened sense of Kal: "to make answer, to put in a reply." Ewald renders quite too artificially: "so then I also plough my field" (אענה Hiph. from the other root ענה, "to be sunk"), which would be proverbial for—"I also begin my speech."

Ver. 18 seq. describe the powerful inward impulse to speak, which Elihu discovers in himself, and which makes it impossible for him to be silent. **The spirit** (ver. 8) **constraineth me in my inward part**; lit. "the spirit of my inward part, of my belly" (בִּטְנִי), comp. ch. xv. 2, 35. Respecting the *scriptio defectiva* מִלְּתִי, in *a*, comp. on ch. i. 21.

Ver. 19. **Behold, my interior is like wine which is not opened**, *i. e.* to which there is no vent, so that it threatens to burst its vessel. It is of course new, fresh wine that is intended, as in the parallel New Testament passages, which refer to this place, Matt. ix. 17; Luke v. 39, which show moreover that the "new bottles" in *b* can be none other than such as are "filled with new wine," so that the attribute "new" denotes not the firmness of the material of the bottles, but rather the age and the quality of their contents. Furthermore, יִבָּקֵעַ is neither a relative clause to אֹבוֹת (Hirzel) [Ges., Con.], nor an adverbial subordinate clause—"when it will burst,"—but the direct predicate of בִּטְנִי, which indeed is feminine, but here with the passive, is treated as the grammatical object; comp. ch. xxii. 9. The LXX. read חֲרָשִׁים, and rendered the preceding אֹבוֹת in the sense of "bellows:" ὥσπερ φυσητὴρ χαλκέως. The figure thus arising is not unsuitable; still, according to the preceding explanation, there is no sufficient ground for departing from the Masoretic reading. On ver. 21 comp. ch. xiii. 8. [The distinction between אַל and לֹא is not to be overlooked; the former expressing the subjective wish, or purpose; the latter the objective fact. E.].

Ver. 22 gives the reason for that which is declared in ver. 21, *b*: **For I know not how to flatter.** אֲכַנֶּה is logically subordinate to the preceding לֹא יָדַעְתִּי, and is used accordingly for the Inf. כַּנּוֹת, or for לְכַנּוֹת; comp. Ewald, § 285, *c.*—**Otherwise my Maker would speedily snatch me away**; lit. "lift me up;" יִשָּׂאֵנִי [which "seems designedly to harmonize with עֹשֵׂנִי" Delitzsch, and perhaps involves a play on אֶשָּׂא, ver. 21; Dillmann], an expression derived from a stormy wind; comp. ch. xxvii. 21; 2 Kings ii. 16. The imperf. here with a modal force [=would, or might]; comp. Ewald, § 136, *f*.

5. *Third section of Elihu's Introduction:* Calling on Job to listen calmly to the discourses of instruction and admonition which follow: ch. xxxiii. 1 7.

Ver. 1. **Nevertheless hear now, O Job, my discourses.** וְאוּלָם interruptive, and introducing to something new, like *verumtamen;* com. ch. i. 11; xi. 5; xii. 7; xiv. 18 and often. The particular address to Job by name, which it is true occurs only in the mouth of Elihu (besides here again in ver. 31 and ch. xxxvii. 14), has nothing in it that is especially surprising, seeing that in every case it serves as a special summons to Job, in distinction from the three friends.

Ver. 2. The circumstantiality with which Elihu announces here the beginning of his discourse is by no means without significance. It is designed to call attention to the importance of that which he has to say to him, and it may be compared in this respect with introductory formulas of the New Testament, such as Matt. v. 2; Acts x. 34; and especially 2 Cor. vi. 11. ["*My tongue hath begun to speak.*" lit. my tongue hath spoken in my palate (the latter word a synecdoche). The Pret. דברה denotes here the present, but as an act reaching over into the present out of the past. This, we have judged, called for the free translation which we have given." Schlottm.]

Ver. 3. **My words are the uprightness of my heart**; they are the honest open expression of the thought of my heart, precisely that therefore which Job had so painfully missed in the three friends (see ch. vi. 25).—**And the knowledge of my lips—they declare it purely**.—The "knowledge of my lips" is either prefixed as *casus absolutus*, "and as touching the knowledge of my lips—they speak it purely;" or as the object: "and what my lips know, that," *etc.*—בָּרוּר can be a predicate accusative ["and knowledge that is pure my lips declare"], referring to דַּעַת, which is elsewhere also used in the masculine (*e. g.* Prov. ii. 10; xiv. 6); but it can just as well be taken adverbially (comp. Ewald, § 279, *a*).

Ver. 4. **The Spirit of God hath made me**, *etc.*—The object of this appeal to the derivation of Elihu's spirit from God's Spirit must be essentially the same with that of the similar utterance in ch. xxxii. 8. It is not a special, nor an altogether wonderful, prophetic inspiration that Elihu here asserts for himself; he simply claims that it is a universal human wisdom residing in his spirit by virtue of his innate dignity as a man, on the basis of which he here applies himself to instruct Job. It is, so to speak, the humanistic, the genuine original and unperverted human character of his knowledge and experimental wisdom, to which Elihu appeals, when, as a young man, he presents himself to the more aged Job as his instructor. It is to this genuinely human character of his wisdom that he calls attention, both in this passage, where he emphasizes the divine origin of his spiritual life (vers. 4, 5), and in the following, where he sets forth his participation in the material part of man's nature, in his earthly human corporeity (ver. 6 seq.). The older Church exegesis readily availed itself of this verse as an argument for the divine trinity, on the ground that it mentions (1) *Deus omnipotens:* (2) *Spiritus Dei* (=*Sapientia s. Filius*); and (3) *Spiraculum Dei* (=*Sp. Sanctus*). So *e. g.* Cocceius on the passage; approximately also Starke.

Ver. 5. **If thou canst, then answer me** (השׁיב as in ch. xxxii. 14), **draw up against me** (עֶרְכָה scil. מִלִּין, see ch. xxxii. 14; לְפָנַי, lit. "before me," here "against me"), **take thy stand**, *viz.* for the controversy, take thy post; the same expression used 1 Sam. xvii. 16 of Goliath's putting himself in a military attitude, and challenging the Israelites to combat.—["The very ring of the words in Heb. has in them the tone of haughty defiance." Schlottmann.]

Ver. 6. **Behold, I am God's, as thou art**; *i. e.*, I stand no nearer to him; I am, like thee, His creature. [The לְ here may be either the לְ of possession, dependence, according to the explanation just given (comp. לוֹ, ch. xii. 16); or the לְ of relation: "I am like thee in relation to God." In our relation to Him we are both equal. The rendering of E. V., Bernard, Barnes: "Behold, I am according to thy wish in God's stead," is much less suitable to the connection, and less in harmony with Elihu's claims.—E.]—**Out of clay was I also formed**: lit. "out of clay was I also cut off, nipped off" (Del.). The verb קרץ (lit. to nip, to pinch), which forcibly and onomatopoetically describes the action of the potter in forming his vessels, is found in Pual only here. Comp. ch. x. 9, and the parallel passages there cited.

Ver. 7. **Behold, my terror will not affright thee**: *i. e.* in view of this my genuinely human and earthly character, thou needest not fear an unequal contest with me, as would be the case against God, whom thou didst pray, that "His majesty might not terrify thee." The passage contains an unmistakable allusion to ch. ix. 34 and xiii. 21,—to the latter passage also by means of the *hapax legom.* אֶכֶף, "pressure, weight," which appears here in place of the like-sounding כַּף, which is there used. The LXX. (ἡ χείρ μου) [E. V. "my hand"] read כַּפִּי also in the present passage, but disregard in so doing the Hebrew usage, which is wont everywhere else to connect the verb כָּבֵד with יָד, not כַּף.

6. *The first speech of Elihu.—a.* Reference to Job's objectionable language, in which he maintains his entire innocence in opposition to God, his hostile persecutor: vers. 8-11.—**Surely, thou hast said in mine hearing**, *etc.*—The restrictive rendering of אַךְ="only" [not otherwise than] (Ewald, Hahn, Dillmann, *etc.*) is less suitable here than the affirmative: "verily, surely" (Rosenm., Hirzel, Umbreit, Delitzsch—in general most of the moderns) [and so E. V.: "To say anything בְּאָזְנַי of another is in Hebrew equivalent to saying it not secretly, and so as to be liable to misconstruction, but aloud and distinctly." Del.].

Vers. 9-11. A collection of several objectionable utterances by Job, which are cited in part literally, in part according to the sense, and with the refutation of which all that follows to the close of these discourses is occupied, so that these three verses contain to some extent the common theme of all the four discourses of Elihu (comp. below on ch. xxxv. 1).—**Pure am I, without** (בְּלִי as in ch. xxxi. 39) **wickedness.** Comp. ch. ix. 21; x. 7; xvi. 17; xxiii. 10; xxvii. 5 seq. The word חַף (lit *tersus*, *lotus*, rubbed down smooth, grown fine) used here in *b* as a synonym of זַךְ, was not used by Job, and occurs only here. The same may be said of תְּנוּאוֹת, "oppositions, hostilities, alienations"

(comp. Num. xiv. 34) in ver. 10 *a*, with which are to be compared utterances of Job like those in ch. x. 13 seq.; xix. 11; xxx. 21. In regard to ver. 10 *b* comp. ch. xiii. 24; and with ver. 11 comp. ch. xiii. 27, which passage Elihu quotes with *literal accuracy*, doubtless because he had taken particular offense at this accusation of God as Job's jailer and most crafty watcher.

7. *Continuation.—b.* Didactic exhibition of the true relation of sinful men to God, who seeks to turn them to Himself by manifold dispensations and communications, to wit: *a. By the voice of conscience in dreams;* vers. 12-18. — **Behold, in this thou art not right, I answer thee** (not: "I will answer thee," Hirzel [E. V.], *etc.*). זאת, accus. of nearer definition to לא־צדקת refers to the citations from Job's speeches in vers. 9-11. Respecting צדק in the signification "to be right," comp. ch. xi. 2. The second member gives the reason for this assertion that Job, with his suspicions of God's greatness and love, was in the wrong: **for Eloah is greater than mortal man**, will not therefore after the manner of man, play the part of a hateful or vindictive persecutor of feeble creatures. [Del. explains: "God is too exalted to enter into a defence of Himself against such vain-glorying interwoven with accusations against Him. And for this reason Elihu will enter the lists for God." But a deeper and more satisfactory meaning is obtained by the explanation in the Commentary. God is too great to be actuated by the petty malignities which Job had imputed to Him. Job was *wrong;* God is JUST, *because* He is GREAT" E. V. and several commentators connect אֶעֶנְךָּ with what follows, either rendering כִּי "that," or "for" with Delitzsch's explanation. But the Masoretic accentuation connects it with what precedes, and this harmonizes better with the poetic rhythm of the verse, and with the weight of thought in *b*.—E.]

Ver. 13. **Why hast thou contended** (רִיבוֹתָ instead of רַבֹּתָ, Gesenius, § 73 [§ 72], 1) **against Him?**—Such striving or murmuring against God on the part of Job had found expression, *e. g.*, in ch. vii. 20; x. 18; xiii. 24 seq.—The second member declares the ground or contents of this contention against God to be: **that [for] He gives account of none of His doings**; lit. "that He answers not (ענה as in ch. xxxii. 12; xl. 2; ix. 3) all His words (or matters, דְּבָרָיו). So correctly Gesenius, Umbreit, Vaih., Delitzsch [E. V., Con., Words., Rod., Elz., Bar., Renan], *etc.*, while the explanations of other moderns vary widely, *e. g.* "to all his (man's) words giveth He no answer" (Hirzel, Heiligst., Hahn) [Carey on the contrary: "since to none of His words doth man answer," *i. e.* man is deaf when God speaks]; or "that all his words to Him (suffix in דבריו referring to the object) He easily answers" (Stickel, and similarly Welte); or "with not a single word does He answer" (Schlottmann, Kamph.); or "that He makes no answer to all *thy* words" (Dillmann, changing דבריו to דְּבָרֶיךָ), *etc.*

Ver. 14. **For** (on the other hand) **God speaketh once and twice**; *i. e.* many times, often, repeatedly; comp. ch. xl. 5; also ch. v. 19. Those commentators who explain: "in many ways" (Arnh., Hirz., Stick., Del., *etc.*) make too much of the simple form of enumeration used; it is only the πολυμερῶς of the divine revelation, and not of also its πολυτρόπως, which is here spoken of. Respecting the בְּ before אחת and שתים, comp. besides ch. xl. 5, also Ps. lxii. 12 [11]. The subj. of the follg. לֹא יְשׁוּרֶנָּה, which the Masoretic accentuation also separates from what goes before, cannot be "God" again, but only man, used indefinitely; hence "one perceiveth it not" (שור with a neut. suffix, in the general meaning of observing, perceiving, precisely as in ch. xxxv. 13). This short clause stands accordingly in a limitative, or an adversative relation to the preceding thought: "*only* man observes it not," or "yet man," *etc.* [E. V.]. It is possible also to render it as a circumstantial clause: "without any one observing it" (Schlottm.). ["God's speech is unnoticed, not recognized by the senses, understood only by the susceptible feelings." Schlottmann.] The explanation of this verse by Schultens, Ewald and Vaihinger is peculiar (comp. the Vulg. and Pesh.): "for God speaks once—He does not glance at it a second time" [*i. e.* to reconsider or change what He has once said]. Against this is (1) the Masoretic accentuation; (2) the connection with ver. 15 seq., which would there stand quite torn apart; (3) the fact that שור cannot signify *revidere* (it would in that case have to be changed into שוב).

Ver. 15 seq. now mention—if not several *kinds* (Hirzel, Schlottm., Del.)—at least several *examples* of impressive communications from God to men, or, according to the language used in ver. 14, of "speeches" by God. The first instance mentioned is that of revelation by dreams, vers. 15-18, which Elihu describes in language which is a close, and in part a literal copy of that of Eliphaz (ch. iv. 12-16). The statement prefixed of time and circumstance (ver. 15) is almost literally the same as ch. iv. 13 (see on the passage).

Ver. 16. **Then opens He the ear of men**; *i. e.* He opens their understanding for His confidential communications; the same phrase in ch. xxxvi. 10, 15; 1 Sam. ix. 15, and often.— **And presses a seal upon their instruction** (מֹסָר, an alternate form of מוּסָר, found only here); *i. e.* He impresses upon them all the more deeply the earnest admonitions and warnings which He administers to them by all the various experiences of life (not particularly by painful diseases as Ewald, Hahn, and Dillmann explain, on the strength of ver. 19 seq.); He assures them by such dreams and visions that they are to recognize such serious dispensations of life as coming from Him, as rules of *His* divine agency in educating men; comp. ch. xxxvi. 10. Note how according to this Elihu regards every man as being continually subject to the operations of a divine discipline. As to חתם with בְּ (different from חתם with בְּעַד, ch. ix. 7), comp. ch. xxxvii. 7. Several of the ancient versions (LXX., Aqu., Pesh.) and Luther

translate as though they had read יְחִתֵּם, "He terrifies them."

Vers. 17, 18. The aim of this nocturnal opening of the ear, and sealing of the divine instruction.—**In order to withdraw man from transgression.**—So according to the improved reading מִמַּעֲשֶׂה (Hirz., Del., Dillm., *etc.*), which is sufficiently attested by the ἀποστρέψαι ἄνθρωπον ἀπὸ ἀδικίας αὐτοῦ [of the LXX.]. According to the common reading מַעֲשֶׂה, *man* must be regarded as subj. of לְהָסִיר: "that he may put away evil-doing." In respect to מעשה, *facinus*, comp. *e. g.* 1 Sam. xx. 19.—**And to hide pride from man**; so that he does not see it, and so remains preserved from it (Hirzel, *etc.*), or: "so that he becomes unaccustomed to it" (Del.). Concerning the syncopated form גֵּוָה, see on ch. xxii. 29. It is unnecessary to amend the verb יְכַסֶּה to יְכַלֶּה, "to cause to disappear" (Dillmann), or to יְנַשֶּׁה, "to set aside, to remove" (Böttcher).

Ver. 18. **To keep back his soul from the grave**, *i. e.* to preserve him from death; comp. Ps. xvi. 10; xxx. 4 [3], 10 [9].—**And his life** (חַיָּה always with Elihu, equivalent to חַיִּים elsewhere; comp vers. 20, 22, 28) **from perishing by the dart.**—So (with Dillmann) [E. V. "by the sword," but שלח rather means "missile"] are we to understand the phrase עָבַר בַּשָּׁלַח, which occurs only here and ch. xxxvi. 12 (comp. עבר in ch. xxxiv. 20). The common explanation: "to precipitate one's self into [or upon] the dart" (*iruere in telum*) is not so natural, and is not confirmed by the expression עָבַר בַּשַּׁחַת in ver. 28, which, although of similar sound, is essentially different in signification (against Hirzel, Delitzsch, *etc*). ["Here everything in thought and expression is peculiar." Del.]

8. *Continuation.* The second instance of the divine visitation; *β. By grievous painful disease:* vers. 19-22. Ewald, Hahn, Dillmann, groundlessly endeavor to treat this new instance as only a special expansion of that which precedes, because that already in ver. 16 reference is made to severe suffering on the part of him to whom God addresses His dream-revelation—an inadmissible forcing of the meaning of מֹסָר in that passage, and at the same time disproved by the ו at the beginning of the present verse, which is a connective, introducing a new thought, not an explicative particle, referring back to מֹסָר, from which it is much too far removed.—**He is chastised also with pains on his bed, while the strife in his bones goes on continually.**—So according to the K'thibh רִיב="strife, contest" [admirably describing disease as a disturbance of the equilibrium of the powers: Del.], and in accordance with the correct rendering of אֵתָן (=אֵיתָן, comp. ch. xxxii. 18) as predicate, not as the attribute of רִיב ("and by the continual conflict," *etc.*), for the latter rendering (Hirzel, Vaih., Del.) is forbidden by the absence of the article before אֵתָן. Following the K'ri, רֹב, which is supported by the ancient versions, and several MSS., we should have to explain (with Ewald, Dillmann, *etc.*): "while the multitude of his limbs is still vigorous throughout" (comp. ch. xii. 19; xx. 11). [E. V.: "and the multitude of his bones with strong (or unceasing) pain." So Aben-Ezra, Junius, Tremellius, Arn. (Vulg.: *et omnia ossa ejus marcescere facit*), but the construction of אתן is unnatural.]

Ver. 20. **And his life makes bread a loathing.**—זִהֲמַתּוּ causative Piel of the verb זָהַם, not found elsewhere in the Hebrew, which, according to the Arabic, signifies "to stink;" hence to cause to stink, to excite loathing (not as intensive of Kal, "to be disgusted," as Rosenm., Umbr., Vaih., Hahn, *etc.*, explain it). חַיָּה again is here not=craving, hunger, any more than the parallel נַפְשׁוֹ in *b*, but as always with Elihu: "life, vital energy." Schlottmann truly remarks: "It expresses very vividly the thought that the proper vital power, the proper ψυχή, when it is consumed by disease, gives one a loathing for that which it otherwise likes as being a necessary condition of its own existence."

Ver. 21. **So that his flesh consumes away** (יִכֶל abbreviated for וַיִּכֶל, comp. Ew. § 233, *a*) **that it cannot be seen**, lit. "away from seeing," or "away from sightliness." Comp. in respect to רֹאִי (pausal form for רְאִי) 1 Sam. xvi. 12; Is. lii. 14; liii. 2.—**And his wasted limbs are scarcely to be seen any more** (or "are become invisible"). So following the K'thibh וּשְׁפִי, which according to the Hebrew root, שפה, "to be bare," expresses the notion of bareness, meagreness (scarcely as Gesen., Hirz., Del., *etc.* think, that of rottenness, putrefaction, after the Aram.), and in connection with the genitive עַצְמוֹתָיו produces the collective notion: "the wasting of his members=his wasted members," with which the plur. predicate, לֹא רֻאּוּ, agree perfectly well (comp. the similar constructions with רֹב or מִסְפַּר above, ch. xxxii. 7; xv. 20; xxi. 21, and often). The K'ri וְשֻׁפּוּ, "and are made bare," owes its origin to the attention being fixed on this incorrectly understood plural רֻאּוּ. ["After יִכֶל and before וַתִּקְרַב the Perf. with ו is out of place." Dillm.] In respect to the pointing רֻאּוּ, with Dagh. in א, comp. Delitzsch on the passage, and Ewald, § 21, *e*. [Green, § 121, 1, who, however, inclines to regard it as Mappik. In either case its function is to indicate the guttural quality of א, here to be carefully observed, to give strength to the description.—E.]

Ver. 22. On *a* comp. ver. 18.—**And his life to the angels of death**, lit. "the slayers, or destroyers" (מְמִתִים), by which are intended not only mortal pains (Rosenm., Schlottmann) [Barnes, Carey], but, according to Ps. lxxviii. 49; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; 1 Chron. xxi. 15, angelic powers sent from God, and commissioned to

destroy men. [The former explanation "does not commend itself, because the Elihu section has a strong angelological coloring in common with the book of Job." Del.]

9. *Continuation.* The third instance of the divine visitation: γ. *By sending a mediating angel as a deliverer out of distress, and so by a wonderful removal of the painful disease and danger of death just described:* vers. 23-28.—**If then there is for him** [עָלָיו, "for," better than "with him"] **an angel, a mediator** (מֵלִיץ here otherwise than in ch. xvi. 20, where it was used *in malem partem*), **one of thousands, to declare to man his duty** (lit. "his uprightness, his right way," comp. Prov. xiv. 2).—Oecolampad., Schult., Schnurr., Bouil., Eichh., Rosenm., Welte, v. Hofmann [Noyes, Barnes, Carey] understand by the מַלְאָךְ מֵלִיץ a *human* interpreter of the will of God, a prophet, or teacher of true wisdom, such as Job had before himself in Elihu. But the ancient reference to an angel (comp. ch. iv. 18) to which the majority of moderns also adhere, is supported by the following considerations. (1) The mention, just before, of the angel of death, to which manifestly there is now about to be introduced a contrast. (2) The contrast with לְאָדָם in *c*, as well as the office of delivering from death, with which, according to ver. 23, the מלאך is invested. (3) His being called "one of a thousand," which would scarcely characterize him as a man of an extraordinary sort, such as can scarcely be met with as one among a thousand, but rather as belonging to the innumerable hosts of heaven—a description, accordingly, which is to be understood not according to Eccles. vii. 28, but according to Dan. vii. 10; Ps. lxviii. 18 [17]. The latter designation, moreover, makes it impossible to regard this mediating or interpreting angel (comp. Gen. xlii. 23; Is. xliii. 27; 2 Chron. xxxii. 31) as an angel of peculiarly high rank, as *e. g.* the Mal'ak-Jehovah of the Pentateuch, or as the "Angel of the Presence," or the Metathron of the later Jewish literature, as Schlottmann and Del. [Lee, Wordsw., Canon Cook in Smith's *Bib. Dic.*] think; for the force of the clause אחד מני־אלף is simply to put this *one* messenger of God on an equality with many others, whom God might in like manner entrust with such a commission, not to exalt him above them. The Messianic meaning, which many expositors attribute to the verse (even among those who understand the מֵ׳ מַ׳ of a human messenger of God, *e. g.* Schultens, Velthusen, J. D. Michaelis, also J. Pye Smith, *Script. Testimony to the Messiah*, I. 307, the last indeed only tentatively, and without definitely deciding the question), is accordingly in any case very indirect and general. Moreover a special Christological *vaticinium* of the kind which the majority of the older exegetes maintained (comp. especially J. D. Michaelis: *De angelo interprete*, Hal. 1707), would scarcely seem appropriate in the mouth of an extra-Israelitish sage of the patriarchal era, any more than that celebrated verse of the Œdipus Coloneus of Sophocles:

"One soul, in my opinion, for ten thousand will suffice
To make atonement, if with kindly feelings it draws nigh,"

could be understood as Messianic otherwise than very remotely (comp. Luthardt, *Apolog. Vorträge* ii. 224).

["In the extra-Israelitish world a far more developed doctrine of angels and demons is everywhere found than in Israel, which is to be understood not only subjectively, but also objectively; and within the patriarchal history after Gen. xvi. that מלאך יהוה (אלהים) appears, who is instrumental in effecting the progress of the history of redemption, and has so much the appearance of the God of revelation, that He even calls Himself God, and is called God. He it is whom Jacob means, when (Gen. xlviii. 15 seq.), blessing Joseph, he distinguishes God the Invisible, God the Shepherd, *i. e.* Leader and Ruler, and "the Angel who delivered (הַגֹּאֵל) me from all evil;" it is the Angel who, according to Ps. xxxiv. 8, encampeth round about them that fear God, and delivereth them; "the Angel of the Presence," whom Isaiah in the *Thephilla*, ch. lxiii. 7 seq., places beside Jehovah and His Holy Spirit as a third *hypostasis*. Taking up this perception, Elihu demands for the deliverance of man from the death which he has incurred by his sins, a superhuman angelic mediator. The "Angel of Jehovah" of primeval history is the oldest prefigurement in the history of redemption of the future incarnation, without which the Old Testament history would be a confused *quodlibet* of premises and radii, without a conclusion and a centre; and the angelic form is accordingly the oldest form which the hope of a deliverer assumes, and to which it recurs, in conformity to the law of the circular connection between the beginning and the end, in Mal. iii. 1." Delitzsch.—See further Remarks on ver. 24.]

Ver. 24 is not the apodosis to the preceding verse (Hirzel, Hahn, Delitzsch, Kamphausen) [E. V., Con., Noyes, Renan, Rodwell], for God's commission to the angel: "Deliver him," *etc.*—belongs as yet to the preliminary conditions of the deliverance, which is first described in ver. 25. The conditional particle of the preceding verse accordingly extends its influence over the present verse: **and (if) He hath mercy on him, and saith,** *etc.*—This divine commission presupposes that the sorely afflicted one has truly repented, and laid to heart the salutary teachings of the angel. It is unnecessary with Schlottmann to take the angel as the subject of this brief clause, for the reason that the exercise of mercy cannot be the function of an angel. —**Deliver him from going down into the pit** (comp. ver. 18 *a*), **I have found a ransom,** *viz.* for him. ["One is here reminded of Heb. ix. 12, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος." Del.] By this is meant the intercession of the mediating angel, who had preached repentance, not in vain, to the sick one, and had therefore appeared before God, interceding in his behalf. Instead of פְּדָעֵהוּ (from a root פָּדַע, *liberare*, which is not elsewhere found, and which is hardly intelligible), it would seem natural to read either פְּדֵהוּ or פְּרָאֵהוּ (from פרה=פרא);

some MSS. show פְּרָעֵהוּ, *solve eum*, which, however, would be suitable only in case the angel addressed were the angel of death. [״כֹּפֶר according to its primary notion is not a covering =making good, more readily a covering=cancelling (from כָּפַר, Talmud, to wipe out, away), but, as the usual combination with עַל shows, a covering of sin and guilt before wrath, punishment, or execution on account of guilt, and in this sense λύτρον, a means of getting free, ransom-money. The connection is satisfied if the repentance of the chastened one (thus *e. g.* also von Hofm.) is understood by this ransom, or better, his affliction, inasmuch as it has brought him to repentance. But wherefore should the mediatorship of the angel be excluded from the notion of the כֹּפֶר? Just this mediatorship is meant, inasmuch as it puts to right him who by his sins had worked death, *i. e.* places him in a condition in which no further hindrance stands in the way of the divine pardon. If we connect the mediating angel, like the angel of Jehovah of the primeval history with God Himself, as then the logos of this mediating angel to man can be God's own logos communicated by him, and he therefore as מליץ, God's speaker (if we consider Elihu's discourse in the light of the New Testament), can be the divine Logos himself, we shall here readily recognize a passage of the mystery which is unveiled in the New Testament: "God was in Christ, and reconciled the world unto Himself." A presage of this mystery, flashing through the darkness, we have already read in ch. xvii. 3 (comp. ch. xvi. 21; and, on the other hand, in order to see how this anticipation is kindled by the thought of the opposite, ch. ix. 33). The presage which meets us here is like another in Ps. cvii.—a Psalm which has many points of coincidence with the book of Job—where in ver. 20 we find: 'He sent His word, and healed them.' At any rate Elihu expresses it as a postulate, that the deliverance of man can be effected only by a superhuman being, as it is in reality accomplished by the man who is at the same time, and from all eternity the Lord of the angels of light." Delitzsch.

In addition to the suggestions which may be found in the two extracts from Delitzsch, given above in favor of explaining the מלאך מליץ of this passage in the higher sense of the O. T. מלי יהוה, the following considerations may be urged:

1. To understand the words of an ordinary angel furnishes no adequate explanation of the description here given of him. Especially is it difficult to understand on this theory why he should be spoken of as "one out of a thousand." Is it (*a*) simply as a rhetorical amplification of the word "angel"—"one of the innumerable hosts of heaven?" (Renan). But this would be here a meaningless rhetorical flourish. What has his being one of a countless angelic company to do with the function here assigned to him? Is it (*b*) as a more precise definition of the *Malakah*, to indicate that he is an angelic, or celestial messenger? (Dillmann). But that would have been expressed in more definite language. Is it (*c*) restrictive—"*but* one among a thousand?" (Rodwell). Apart from the obscurity of the language to express such a thought, it is difficult to see the force of such a restriction. Not to indicate any unwillingness on the part of the angels in general, for that would be nothing to the purpose. It could only serve to magnify God's willingness to be gracious—let *but one* mediator appear, and God will have mercy. But to this there are several decisive objections. (1) It is against the proper view of the connection, according to which ver. 24 is not the consequent, but a part of the conditional antecedent. (2) It seems to be founded on the opinion that *mêlîtz* means an "intercessor" (so Rodwell—"interceding angel"), whereas he is *God's* representative, not man's. (3) It lies outside the scope of the passage. The sufferer has in the verses immediately preceding been brought to the verge of the grave. But all at once a glorious possibility presents itself—a Messenger from God, to show the sufferer the way of right, mercifully commissioned to deliver him, and lo! he is rescued, his youth renewed, and he beholds the face of God in joy! To interject the thought that such a messenger would be *only* one of a thousand like himself, would be confusing and weakening The same objection would apply still more forcibly if we should take it to mean (*d*) *any* one of a thousand.

But 2: understood of a מלאך of high rank, the words are significant. They indicate dignity, superiority.* He is *One* out of, or above (מִן combining its local and comparative force) a thousand, or thousands, or the thousand. Good explains: "one of the supreme chyliad, the preeminent thousand that shine at the top of the empyreal hierarchy, possessed of transcendent and exclusive powers, and confined to functions of the highest importance." Granting that this explanation of אלף is problematical, it may still be said that whether we take it indefinitely for "a thousand" or collectively for "thousands," *i. e.* all the angels, the phrase—"ONE *out of* a thousand"—most naturally suggests rareness, pre-eminence. And this view of it accords with the rest of the description.

(1) The term מֵלִיץ, in such a connection, would naturally convey the idea of dignity. He is an ambassador, *internuncius* (see 2 Chron. xxxii. 31), an angelic envoy endowed with an extraordinary commission—certainly not here, as the context shows, the mere mouthpiece of another (as in Gen. xlii. 23).

(2) His function—"to show to man the right way" (his rightness, his true life)—suggests at once the PROPHET foretold by Moses (Deut. xviii. 15 seq.), one who should interpret—declare—more clearly than mere man could the will of God by which man is to be saved.

(3) His remedial commission, it will be seen, is extraordinary: (*a*) In its origin, in the special, solemn, formal manner in which he is invested with it. (*b*) In its nature—involving as

* This is the meaning of the clause assumed by the commentators who suppose a human messenger to be referred to; *e. g.* Rosenmüller: *facit ad dignitatem ejus commendandam.*

it does deliverance from the pit, and the completion of man's ransom—כֹּפֶר—a word used again by Elihu (ch. xxxvi. 18) in the most solemn connection with reference to deliverance from the most terrible of destinies (comp. also Ps. xlix. 8, and the use of the cognates כִּפֶּר, כִּפֻּרִים, and כַּפֹּרֶת, as significant of the expiation of sin): (*c*) In its results—especially as embracing reconciliation with God (ver. 26).

3. Add that the idea of *Divine Grace*, as developed so remarkably in vers. 26-27, comes into more fitting connection with such an interpretation of the passage as involves an evangelic anticipation of the revelation of grace in Christ, the great *μεσίτης*.

4. The passage is not indeed to be constrained into a complete exposition of Christ's mediatorial office. Here, as elsewhere in our book, the truth is fragmentary, obscure, a prophetic hint, little more than the yearning after a possibility. This consideration however would all the more seem to put it in the category of such passages as ch. xiv. 14 seq.; xvii. 3; xix. 25 seq. It is a hypothesis, hanging on an *If*—אִם־יֵשׁ—but it is an *If*, the answer to which is the *Amen* of the Gospel.

If, as shown above, the language itself *points* in the highest direction here indicated, we are still further justified in taking that direction by the position which must be accorded to Elihu's discourses in the book. Assuming here their genuineness, they must be regarded as a part of the solution of the problem. So regarded, it would seem strange if they did not once show us those heights of aspiration and faith, of which Job's words have already given us such wonderful glimpses. On the other hand, it should *not* seem to us strange that the young sage, the precursor of Jehovah, in the disentanglement of the book's mystery, whose especial mission in the book it is to throw the light of inspired thought on the mystery, should reflect upon it some rays from the mediatorial CROSS. E.].

Ver. 25. *Apodosis* to ver. 23 seq.: (then) **his flesh swells with the vigor of youth.** In respect to the Perf. quadril. רֻטֲפַשׁ "to be over-juicy, to swell," comp. Ewald, § 131, g [Green, § 180, a]. נֹעַר [peculiar to the Elihu section] here and in ch. xxxvi. 14, instead of the customary נְעוּרִים. The מִן before this word is used not comparatively, but causally, as the parallel thought in *b* shows.

Ver. 26. **If he prayeth to Eloah, He accepteth him graciously** (comp. ch. xxii. 27), **and causeth him to behold His face with rejoicing,** or: "so that he sees His face with rejoicing:" both renderings are equally possible, according as we render וירא as imper. Kal, or Hiph. The rendering of Umbreit and Ewald, however, is inappropriate: "and He cause his face to look upon joy," because ראה בְּ already signifies of itself, "to see joy" (see ver. 28 *b*).—**And He gives back again to man his righteousness,** which he had lost; not "requites to man his uprightness," as Delitzsch (after Luther) translates, for ver 27 *b* does not agree with this. Moreover to express this idea of the recompense of upright actions, we should rather expect to find כְּצִדְקָתוֹ. The idea of a righteousness in the rescued sinner, restored to him by God as a free gift, is peculiar to Elihu. It at least retires quite into the background in the descriptions, otherwise quite similar, of the three friends, such as ch. v. 19 seq.; viii. 21; xi. 15 seq.; xxii. 23 seq., and thus characterizes Elihu's religious and ethical views as more free from legal narrowness and externality.

Ver. 27. **He singeth to man, and saith.** יָשֹׁר, abbreviated Imperf. from שִׁיר=שׁוּר (comp. ch. xxxvi. 24). עַל־אֲנָשִׁים, lit. "to men, addressed to them;" comp. Prov. xxv. 20. As to the thought, however, comp. Ps. xxii. 23 [22] seq.; li. 14, and often. The song of thanksgiving chanted by the redeemed and justified one [a "psalm *in nuce*," Del.] now begins, and extends to the end of the following verse.—**Still it was not recompensed to me**; lit. "it was not made equal to me," *non æquatum est mihi* (שָׁוָה, neuter or impersonal) [E. V.: "and it profited me not" (Syr., Targ.) is a legitimate rendering of the Heb., but is far less appropriate to the connection. It misses entirely the recognition of *grace*, in that he had not received the just recompense of his sins. The rendering of the first part of the verse is also more forced, and less satisfactory, when יָשֹׁר is rendered: "He looketh," and וַיֹּאמֶר: "and if any say:" against which may still further be urged the *Vav. consec.* here, and the Perf. פָּדָה, and the K'thibh נַפְשִׁי in 28 *a*.—E.].

Ver. 28. **He hath redeemed my soul** (read with the K'thibh נַפְשִׁי, for the eucharistic discourse of the redeemed one is still continued here), **from going down into the pit** (comp. ver. 18), **and my life shall enjoy seeing the light**; *i. e.* the light of this world (John xi. 9), which, as the upper world, stands here in contrast with the gloomy "grave," and so also in ver. 30; comp. ch. iii. 16, 20. Delitzsch, against the context, and with an interpolation of thought: "in the light of the divine (countenance, in the gracious presence of God."

10. *Conclusion:* first of all (vers. 29, 30) of the second chief division—teaching the gracious and righteous dispensations of God in educating His human children; and then (vers. 31–33) of the whole discourse—the last sentence being a summons to Job to hear attentively the discourses of instruction which follow.—**Behold, all this God does**—referring back to all of which he has spoken from ver. 14 on, with a recurrence in particular of the idea of repeatedness found also in that passage, for this is what is expressed there by באחת and בשתים, here by פַּעֲמַיִם שָׁלוֹשׁ *bis terque*—an expression which on account of the lack of the וְ between the two adverbs of time, the ancient versions misunderstood, and so read as though it were פְּעָמִים שָׁלשׁ ["three times;" E. V. more indefinitely "oftentimes"].

Ver. 30. On *a* comp. ver. 18; on *b*, ver. 28, and Ps. lvi. 14 [13]. ["שַׁחַת here for the fifth time in this speech, without being anywhere

interchanged with שְׁאוֹל or another synonym, which is remarkable." Del.] לֵאוֹר, syncopated form of the Inf. Niphal, instead of לְהֵאוֹר [Gr., § 159, 2], "that he may be lighted, or enlightened with the light of life" (in contrast with the darkness of death, with which he had already been overshadowed.

Ver. 31. **Attend, O Job, and hearken to me.**—This can scarcely be regarded as a summons to ponder quietly on what he had heard (Del.), but rather to listen to what he had further to communicate, as *b* incontrovertibly proves.

Ver. 32. **If** (however) **thou hast words, then reply to me** (comp. ver. 5); **speak, for I desire thy justification,** *i. e.* not "that thou shouldst justify thyself" (Hirzel), but that thou mayest stand vindicated, I wish to see thee declared righteous (comp. ch. xxxii. 2, with ch. xxxiii. 26 *c*). Here also again the normal evangelical notion of justification, in contrast with all false self-justification, is expressed by Elihu.

Ver. 33. **If not** (אִם אַיִן, to wit מִלִּין, comp. Gen. xxx. 1), **then do thou hear me.** אַתָּה emphatic: "thou on thy part."—**Be silent** (as in ver. 31 *b*), **and I will teach thee wisdom.** חָכְמָה here instead of the דֵּעַ several times used in the introduction (comp. ch. xxxii. 6 *b*, 10, 17; xxxiii. 3). אֲאַלֶּפְךָ, "to teach," as in ch. xv. 5

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Partly on the ground of Elihu's circumstantial self-introduction in ch. xxxii. 6–xxxiii. 7, partly on the ground of the first discourse of admonition and instruction which immediately follows, very unfavorable judgments have from ancient times down to our own been delivered in respect to the person and the religious and ethical stand-point of this speaker. Following the example of Jerome,* Gregory the Great, at the close of his exposition of the first discourse, describes Elihu as an *arrogans*, who *dum vera ac mystica loquitur, subito per tumorem cordis quædam inania ac superba permiscet.* The Venerable Bede even identifies him with the false prophet (*ariolus*) Balaam,† following perhaps the guidance of the Rabbis, for in the Talmud and Midrash the same worthless conceit recurs (as in like manner it seems to be an anonymous Jewish writer, who recently [in Bernstein's *Analecten*, Vol. III., under the title, *Der Satan als Irrgeist und Engel des Lichts*] has made the attempt to represent Elihu as Satan in disguise). Olympiodorus judges him more favorably, but is still of opinion that he has not done full justice to Job, the truly pious and holy man, and is for that same reason at last neither praised nor blamed by God (*Catena in Job*, ed. Loud. p. 484). Most of the Jesuit commentators in modern times regard Elihu as an empty, puffed-up boaster, whom God rightly ignores, and whose hatred against Job is to be explained from his near relationship to him, his Nahorite descent; so *e. g.* Escobai (*Comment. in Biblia*, Tom. IV., p. 94, 125); while other Roman Catholic exegetes, *e. g.* the Capuchin Volducius (*Comment.* Tom. II., p. 445 seq.) adjudge him to be in the right, so far as all that is essential is concerned.—Among Protestant commentators Luther, so far as may be gathered from various scattered intimations, partly from his translation of chs. xxxii–xxxvii., partly from his Introduction to the book of Job, and other expressions on the subject, seems to have put Elihu's discourses, as respects their theological value and contents, on the same plane with those of the three friends. Vict. Strigel renders a decidedly unfavorable verdict upon them, Elihu being to him an *exemplum ambitiosi oratoris, qui plenus sit ostentatione et audacia insinuata in mente.* Herder calls Elihu's speech, in comparison with the majestic thunder-speech of the Creator, "the weak, rambling talk of a boy," and says: "Elihu, a young prophet, intemperate, bold, alone wise, draws fine pictures, without end or aim; hence no one answers him, and he stands there as a mere shadow" (*Vom Geist der Ebr. Pœsie*, p. 101, 142). Umbreit's language is similar, only yet stronger. Elihu's appearance he describes as "the uncalled-for stumbling in of a conceited young philosopher into the conflict that is already properly ended," and "the silent contempt with which he is allowed to speak is the merited reward of a babbler" (*Komment.*, 2d Ed., p. XXV seq.). In like manner Wohlfarth, who says that Elihu is "a vainglorious conceited boaster, as it were a spiritual Goliath!" M. Sachs (*Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1834, IV. p. 416 seq.), and A. Hahn, who (*Komment.* p. 18) calls him "a most conceited and arrogant young man, who with all his undeniable scientific knowledge is boastful and officious" [Noyes, who calls him "forward"], and this in accordance with the purpose of the poet, who represents him as such a character intentionally. The judgment of those who oppose the genuineness of the Elihu-episode is naturally to some extent unfavorable. See a number of such expressions collected together out of de Wette's Introduction, in Umbreit (*l. c.*); also Eichhorn in Schlottmann, p. 54; v. Hofmann in Delitzsch (II., 240); and very recently Dillmann's closing opinion in respect to Elihu's self-introduction (p. 297): "The impression which this long introductory discourse makes on the reader is not favorable; Elihu's self-praise, and his verbose vaunting of that which he is about to do, is somewhat unseemly," *etc.* So also what he says of the first discourse (p. 304)—that Elihu's representation of the suffering of Job as a means of discipline and improvement employed by God exhibits throughout nothing new, that it is "precisely the same method of explanation as that which the three friends had adopted in the beginning of the controversy, which Eliphaz especially, in ch. v. 17 seq., had sharply and clearly expressed," and which Job would have been perfectly justified in rejecting as unacceptable.

* Or rather of the Pseudo-Jerome, *i. e.* of that presbyter, Philippus, whose *Expositio interlinearis* on our book, found among the works of Jerome, was afterwards revised by the Venerable Bede (comp. *Opp. Hieronymi*, ed. Vallars, Tom. III., Append. p. 895 seq.).

† Sunt alii extra ecclesiam, qui Christo ejusque ecclesiæ similiter adversantur, quorum imaginem prætulit Balaam ille ariolus, qui et Elieu sicut patrum traditio habet, qui contra ipsum sanctum Job multa improbe et injuriose locutus est, in tantum ut etiam displiceret inconcinna ejus et indisciplinata loquacitas (Bedæ *Opp.* ed. Basil. III., c. 602).

To these unfavorable judgments respecting the character of their speaker there may indeed be opposed, a number equally large of such as are favorable, which, finding their principal support as well in ch. xxxii. and xxxiii. see in Elihu a direct forerunner, not only on the negative, but also on the positive side, of the final decision of the controversy by Jehovah. So already Augustine, according to whom Elihu *ut primas partes modestiæ habuit ita et sapientiæ ;* Chrysostom, who represents him in two respects—in respect of his speech, and of his silence—as an eloquent witness to true wisdom; * subsequently Thomas Aquinas (*Opp.* Tom. I., p. 137, 184, ed. Venet.), Brentius, Oecolampadius, Calvin, Pareau (see the passage quoted out of his commentary above in the Introduction § 10, Rem.) Cocceius, Sebastian Schmidt, Starke, [Schultens, Lightfoot, Bp. Patrick, Matt. Henry], *etc.;* and quite recently in particular Schlottmann, Räbiger (*De l. Jobi sent. primaria*), Hengstenberg, Völk, and the greater part of those who advocate the genuineness of these discourses [to whom may be added some even of the opponents of their genuineness, such as Davidson, Introd. II., pp. 210-213 ; Delitzsch II., 239 seq.]. We must declare ourselves decidedly in favor of the latter estimate of the value and import of this section, although it seems to us a one-sided, or at least an incautious statement to say that it is (according to Hengstenberg's *Vortrage über das Buch Hiob*, p. 27) "the throbbing heart" of the whole poem, or that (according to v. Gerlach, *A. T.* III., 86) these discourses "give us the true intent of the whole, the views of the author himself, or that Elihu, unlike the three friends, is introduced as standing within the pale of the Abrahamitic revelation (so Vilmar, see above on ch. xxxii. 2). It is certainly the poet's intention that Elihu should be regarded as a factor needing to be corrected or to be supplemented by the entire colloquy, otherwise he would not actually furnish such very important supplementary additions as are found in Jehovah's discourses, and the final action in the epilogue. But he does unquestionably represent him as a speaker who approaches very closely the complete Divine truth, nearer than any one of the preceding speakers. This is seen at the outset in the way he introduces himself in these two chapters, and lays down the foundation of the didactic discussion which follows.

2. Respecting the point, that in Elihu's self-introduction, as well as in the poet's introduction which precedes it (ch. xxxii. 2-6), there is nothing that is unbecoming, nothing that justifies the charge of vanity, or an overweening self-conceit, or idle loquacity against Elihu, see above Introduction § 10, *ad* 6 and 7 seq. Here attention is specially called to the fact that the frequency and confidence with which he puts forth his *knowledge* (ch. xxxii. 6 *b*, 10, 17; xxxiii. 3) was indispensable, inasmuch as it was precisely on this intellectual possession of the speaker that his right to make his appearance along with those men so much older than himself rested, inasmuch indeed as, if he had *not* been endowed with an extraordinary fullness of knowledge and wisdom, he could not have escaped the reproach of impudent self-intrusion, or shameless arrogance. The reader is still further reminded there that the humility and modesty of Elihu appear not only in the fact that as the youngest he had hitherto been silent, but also in the fact that at the close of his self-introduction he solemnly declares (ch. xxxiii. 4-7) that it is his purpose to address himself to Job *as man to man*, as the medium accordingly of a wisdom which is purely human, and which by no means denies its earthly origin—not as though he were about presumptuously to communicate a divine revelation which should confound or terrify him, in short not as a preacher of repentance, or a prophet, thundering upon him from above (see the Exegetical Remarks on the above passages.)

3. This same purely human, and for that reason mild and humane impress stamps itself on *the beginning of his didactic expositions in the first discourse.* Elihu here exhibits himself as far less of a legalist than the three censurers of Job who have preceded him. He certainly does maintain against Job that his assertion that he is altogether pure and innocent, and his other assertion, that God is cruelly persecuting him, are without justification and presumptuous (ver. 12 seq.). But instead of at once proceeding to threaten him with God's direst punishments for his conduct, or setting before his eyes that terrible picture of the irretrievable destruction of obstinate evil-doers, which was the favorite theme of the descriptions of his predecessors, he assumes an incomparably gentler, more comforting, more affectionate tone. He puts in the foreground—herein proving himself to be a genuine teacher of wisdom, an apostle of the real Divine wisdom revealed in the New Testament—the idea of the מוסר (ch. xxxiii. 16), *i. e.* of chastisement, of God's discipline, strict and yet mild as that of a father, attributes to Job's grievous suffering essentially the significance which is conferred upon it by such a disciplinary standard (such purifying suffering in the way of *temptation*, in contrast with suffering merely in the way of *trial* *), and in a friendly way points out to Job how near God is to him in the midst of his misery, and how little reason he has to doubt His help and deliverance. He then describes this deliverance itself, on the one side as depending on the intervention of a superhuman mediating angel, commissioned to declare to him the merciful and gracious will of God (ver. 23 seq.), on the other side as immediately followed

* Ἑκατέρωθεν οὖν αὐτοῦ τὴν σύνεσιν στοιχάζομεν ἀπὸ τῆς σιγῆς ἀπό τε τῆς διαλέξεως. *De Patient. Job.*, Homil. IV.

* In respect to the distinction between suffering for temptation, and suffering for trial, comp. Vilmar, *Past.-Theol.*, XI. 62 seq., (also *Theolog. Moral.* I. 174 seq.). A *temptation* is, according to this striking discrimination, which is no less instructive than Scriptural, "a punitive act of God (inflicted through Satan), by which man is to be made conscious that in his inmost soul the adversary can yet find points of contact, by which to allure and urge him onward. By the temptation the secret sin is first disclosed, then perceived, and finally overcome (comp. Ps. xc. 8)." The object of a trial on the other hand is simply to prove those whom God has already recognized as holy and good to be such. The suffering of trial, as the same is described especially in Ps. xlii. and lvi. (to some extent also in the book of Job,—a fact not sufficiently recognized by Vilmar), "does not exclude the entire nearness of God, and the consciousness of this nearness, whereas in temptation the gracious nearness of God is not only not realized, but on the contrary God appears as a God afar off, as an angry God," *etc.*

by the gracious restoration of his former righteousness, a "justification" (ver. 26 *c;* ver. 32) which is to be viewed as forgiveness, or a solemn readmission to the position of a child of God. In both these utterances respecting the deliverance hypothetically promised to Job, *Elihu approximates most remarkably the fundamental features of the New Testament revelation of salvation.* For his idea of justification differs from the evangelical Pauline idea only in the absence of a direct reference to the crucified and risen Redeemer as the ground of the δικαίωσις (*causa meritoria justificationis*). His supposition that God would send one of His thousands of angels, as a mediating power, to a sorely tried and chastised mortal, to rescue and convert him, and to instruct him concerning the way of salvation, and so to facilitate his redemption and restoration to the energy and joy of a new life, comes in contact indeed only remotely with the Messianic idea. For certain as it is that the mediatorial angel of *salvation* is put essentially on an equality with the angel of *disease* and *death* mentioned just before, not exalted above him (comp. ver. 22 *b*, with Matt. viii. 9, and parallel passages), so certain is it that the passage is related only indirectly to the idea and fact of the Gospel revelation of the divine-human mediator, Jesus Christ. It does nevertheless unquestionably stand in a certain typical and prophetic relation to the New Testament ideas of the Messiah. This is made certain by the fact that the commission with which the mediatorial messenger from God is entrusted is not of a physical, external and medicinal character, but before all *redemptive* in the religious and ethical sense, and also by the fact that the messenger whom Elihu supposes to be entrusted with the execution of this divine commission is not an earthly and human, but a heavenly, superhuman being (comp. the Exeget. Rem. on ver. 23). In more than one respect accordingly does this speaker, even in this his first didactic exposition, show his superiority to the three friends. He reveals a higher calling, and shows incomparably greater skill than they in producing an enlightening, ennobling and elevating influence on the mind of Job, longing as he does for heavenly comfort; and he proves himself to be in truth the most advanced, the most richly furnished, intellectually the largest possessor of the human Chokmah among the four who successively encounter Job as human comforters and teachers of wisdom. Comp. Starke's remarks: "Elihu sees much deeper into the mystery of affliction than the three former friends. He is much more discreet and reasonable in his intercourse with Job than the others; he does not make him out a hypocrite, or one who is evidently ungodly, but he shows how by affliction God would purge him of all reliance on his own righteousness, and simply point him to the righteousness of the Messiah. What he says so beautifully ver. 23 in respect to the intercession of the mediator, and the whole context clearly show this to be his purpose."

4. In a *homiletic* respect, it is of course the second half of the section here embraced by us, or ch. xxxiii. 8-33, that furnishes by far the richest and most fruitful material. Here Elihu, the Aramaic sage of the patriarchal age, presents himself as the proclaimer of truths which show many points of contact with those of the New Testament system of redemption, and which justify us in regarding him as an unconscious *prophet of Christ*, if not of His person, at least of His work. Much that is stimulating may nevertheless be derived even from the first introductory half, especially when we take, as our highest point of observation, the circumstance that Elihu there desires to apologize for *his youth*, and for that reason sets forth so much in detail the necessity for his speaking. The basis for such reflections might be found in some such parallel as *Elihu — Jeremiah — Timothy* (comp. Jer. i. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 12).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Particular Passages.

Ch. xxxii. 2 seq. Zeyss: It is not wrong to show wrath against evil, especially where God's honor is concerned. But we must take particular care that such a holy fire of righteous anger be not mixed with the strange fire of earthly affections. Eph. iv. 26.

Ch. xxxii. 6 seq. Coccejus: The man who is about to plant seed in his field, first weeds out noxious herbs, and ploughs thoroughly the surface of the soil. He who expects to instil his own arguments into the mind of another, must first mollify it, and free it of suspicion, in order that afterwards it may receive more eagerly that which is to be communicated. The obstacles in the way of Elihu seemed to be the suspicion of arrogance on his part, and his age, and also the authority of the friends, and their opinion concerning themselves. He attacks the first obstacle in these verses, *etc.*—Jo. Lange: In true wisdom, that which is of importance is —not age, but—the illumination of the Holy Spirit. If young people have a clear perception of divine things, those who are older need not be ashamed to hear them, and to learn from them.—V. Gerlach: The illumination of the Holy Ghost is not confined to old age. This very saying (ver. 9) shows that we must not take offence at the apparent boastfulness of Elihu's words, seeing that he gives the glory not to himself, but to God. The vivid, copious, oriental style gives to the discourse a different look in the eyes of the less ardent inhabitants of the West, from what it had in its own fatherland.

Ch. xxxii. 18 seq. Starke: The man whose heart is full, his mouth runs over. Let a man therefore store up goodly treasure in his heart, and he will speak that which is good and useful. —Dost thou find in thyself a strong impulse to say or do something, first search well to see whether it proceeds from a good or an evil spirit (Rom. viii. 14).—V. Gerlach: At the close he repeats the assurance that although he presumes to speak, and to rebuke the aged, he nevertheless feels himself under a divine compulsion, and can therefore have in view only the glory of God, not that of any man whatsoever.

Ch. xxxiii. 4-7. Brentius: This is a most potent reason why one should not despise another, nor treat him scornfully. For we have all

been made by the same God, through the same Word, in the same Spirit; we have earth, water, air, heaven, as our common heritage. But if you look at Christians, they have a still closer bond uniting them together; for in Eph. iv. it is said: There is one body, one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, *etc.;* and in Rom. xiv.: Destroy not thy brother, for whom Christ died. If therefore this idea were treasured up deep in our faith, it would without difficulty restrain us from wronging, despising or slandering our brethren, if we verily believed that our brother is of such dignity that Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, for his sake descended from heaven, and poured out His blood.

Ch. xxxiii. 15 seq. OECOLAMPADIUS: It behooved that this way (that of an *αποκάλυψις* by dreams) should have been the first and most familiar to us, so that written communications would have been superfluous, the Holy Spirit writing on our hearts. But after that we had turned aside from God to the vanity of this world, it is one of the rarest things known. Philosophers, ignoring both the dignity of man and the harm wrought by sin, have decided that man can acquire knowledge only through the teaching of the senses; for which reason they also deride the gift of *αποκάλυψις.* Elihu seems to have spoken not of ordinary dreams, but of such as visited Abimelech and Laban.—ZEYSS: After that God had at sundry times and in divers manners spoken to the fathers, by revelations, visions, and dreams, *etc.*, as well as by the prophets, He hath at last spoken to us by His Son. He therefore who values his own happiness, and would escape destruction, let him believe and obey the Word of God.—V. GERLACH: A sufferer, who lives in fellowship with God, receives from Him in dreams of the night (and in many such ways), instructive intimations respecting the divine purposes in his calamities; he thus learns to understand aright what God would say to him in such ways. Elihu intimates here (especially in ver. 16) that Job might have received divine communications, without observing them.

Ch. xxxiii. 23 seq. COCCEIUS: This passage makes evident to us the faith of the Ancient Church touching the Mediator. . . . These things indeed are spoken by Elihu, in accordance with the condition of those times, *αἰνιγματωδέστερον*; but they are nevertheless in such exact accordance with the predictions of the prophets, and the declarations of the Apostles, that unless it be supposed that the Holy Spirit wished to lead the men of old somewhere else than towards the mystery of the Gospel, and to teach something else than the same forms of speech would convey in later times, there is not the slightest doubt that this is the true meaning of these words of Elihu, which had proceeded from the Spirit of God, and which were understood by himself in accordance with his own standard. Neither indeed was there anything which Elihu could more readily or suitably impress upon Job. For although Job had clearly enough professed faith in a Mediator, especially in ch. xix. (?), he had nevertheless not so evidently touched upon the doctrine concerning Christ's merits and satisfaction, nor had he in his discussions either considered this usefulness of affliction, which Elihu sets forth, or magnified it in proportion to its worth.—STARKE: see above [Doctrinal, *etc.*] No. 3.—WOHLFARTH: Although an unprejudiced exposition cannot find in these words the doctrine of an atonement through Jesus Christ, we have nevertheless so obvious a reminder of Christ here, that we cannot help observing it. If in ancient times men placed their hope in the intercession of heavenly spirits with God, how much more glorious the consolation which we have, who can say with exultation: We thank Thee, O God, that Thou hast so loved the world, *etc.*, (John iii. 16; 2 Cor. v. 19-21; 1 Pet. i. 24).—V. GERLACH: We are not to infer from the language here used that there is a particular angel, whose office it is to bring the prayers of men before God; rather does the expression—"one of a thousand"—denote one of the many messengers of God, who are appointed to watch over the life of His people, and to conduct them to eternal bliss (Heb. i. 14). It does however contain the thought of representation, intercession before God, and in so far this passage points to the only Mediator between God and men (1 Tim. ii. 5), and likewise to the Holy Ghost, who intercedes for God's children with groanings that cannot be uttered (Rom. viii. 26), and is thus an anticipation of the New Testament. The thought to which Elihu here gives expression is essentially related to that which Job has already expressed in ch. xvii. 3; xix. 25, although it is by no means the same thought . . . . But here the thought is supplied which is there wanting,—that the office of the redeeming angel is not so much to attest the innocence, or the already perfected righteousness of men before God, but rather as man's advocate to intercede in his behalf because of his repentance. This it was in the perception of which Job was as yet lacking.

Ch. xxxii. 26 seq. From the regeneration and quickening of the Gospel the most abundant fruits grow. First prayer, than which a greater gift can scarcely come from God to man. . . . The second fruit is the joy of the Holy Ghost, which is God's sweet face gladdening our consciences. . . The third fruit is confession—not that which is of the ear, auricular, but the true confession of the heart, the acknowledgment of sins, *etc.*—STARKE: So beautifully has Elihu seen into the ways and purposes of God, even in the midst of trials, and where it seems as though He would destroy and cast off a soul, that he puts forth the assurance that it all has no other end in view than the true, eternal deliverance of the sufferer. And this was exactly the plaster for Job's wounds, in order that his pain and his disquietude under the strokes of God's hands might be assuaged and allayed, while he should be led to perceive God's faithfulness, and to thank Him for it.

SECOND DISCOURSE.

Proof that man is not right in doubting God's righteousness:

CHAPTER XXXIV.

a. Opening: Censure of the doubt of God's righteousness expressed by Job:

VERS. 1–9.

1 Furthermore Elihu answered and said:

2 Hear my words, O ye wise men;
and give ear unto me, ye that have knowledge.
3 For the ear trieth words,
as the mouth tasteth meat.
4 Let us choose to us judgment:
let us know among ourselves what is good.

5 For Job hath said: "I am righteous;
and God hath taken away my judgment.
6 Should I lie against my right?
my wound is incurable without transgression."
7 What man is like Job,
who drinketh up scorning like water?
8 Which goeth in company with the workers of iniquity,
and walketh with wicked men?
9 For he hath said: "It profiteth a man nothing
that he should delight himself with God."

b. Proof that the Divine righteousness is necessary, and that it really exists.

a. From God's disinterested love of His creatures:

VERS. 10-15.

10 Therefore hearken unto me, ye men of understanding!
Far be it from God that He should do wickedness;
and from the Almighty, that He should commit iniquity!
11 For the work of a man shall He render unto him,
and cause every man to find according to his ways.
12 Yea, surely God will not do wickedly,
Neither will the Almighty pervert judgment.
13 Who hath given Him a charge over the earth?
or who hath disposed the whole world?
14 If He set His heart upon man,
if He gather unto Himself his spirit and his breath;
15 All flesh shall perish together,
and man shall turn again unto dust.

β. From the idea of God as Ruler of the world:

VERS. 16-30.

16 If now thou hast understanding, hear this:
hearken to the voice of my words.
17 Shall even he that hateth right govern?
and wilt thou condemn Him that is Most Just?

18 Is it fit to say to a king, "Thou art wicked?"
and to princes, "Ye are ungodly?"
19 How much less to Him that accepteth not the persons of princes,
nor regardeth the rich more than the poor?
for they all are the work of His hands.

20 In a moment shall they die,
and the people shall be troubled at midnight, and pass away:
and the mighty shall be taken away without hand.

21 For His eyes are upon the ways of man,
and He seeth all his goings.
22 There is no darkness, nor shadow of death,
where the workers of iniquity may hide themselves.
23 For He will not lay upon man more than right;
that he should enter into judgment with God.
24 He shall break in pieces mighty men without number,
and set others in their stead.

25 Therefore He knoweth their works,
and He overturneth them in the night, so that they are destroyed.
26 He striketh them as wicked men
in the open sight of others;
27 Because they turned back from Him,
and would not consider any of His ways:
28 So that they cause the cry of the poor to come unto Him,
and He heareth the cry of the afflicted.
29 When He giveth quietness, who then can make trouble?
and when He hideth His face, who then can behold Him?
whether it be done against a nation, or against a man only:
30 That the hypocrite reign not,
lest the people be ensnared.

c. Exhibition of Job's inconsistency and folly in reproaching God with injustice, and at the same time appealing to His decision:

VERS. 31-37.

31 Surely it is meet to be said unto God—
"I have borne chastisement, and will not offend any more:
32 That which I see not teach Thou me:
If I have done iniquity, I will do no more."
33 Should it be according to thy mind? He will recompense it, whether thou refuse,
or whether thou choose; and not I:
therefore speak what thou knowest.
34 Let men of understanding tell me,
and let a wise man hearken unto me.
35 Job hath spoken without knowledge,
and his words were without wisdom.
36 My desire is that Job may be tried unto the end,
because of his answers for wicked men.
37 For he addeth rebellion unto his sin,
he clappeth his hands among us,
and multiplieth his words against God.

THIRD DISCOURSE.

Refutation of the false position that piety is not productive of happiness to men:

CHAPTER XXXV.

a. The folly of the erroneous notion that piety and godliness are alike of little advantage to men:

VERS. 1-8.

1 Elihu spake, moreover, and said:

2 Thinkest thou this to be right,
that thou saidst "My righteousness is more than God's?"
3 For thou saidst, "What advantage will it be unto thee?"
and, "What profit shall I have if I be cleansed from my sin?"
4 I will answer thee,
and thy companions with thee.

5 Look unto the heavens, and see;
and behold the clouds which are higher than thou.
6 If thou sinnest, what doest thou against Him?
or if thy transgressions be multiplied, what doest thou unto Him?
7 If thou be righteous, what givest thou Him?
or what receiveth He of thine hand?
8 Thy wickedness may hurt a man as thou art,
and thy righteousness may profit the son of man.

b. The true reason why the deliverance of the sufferer is often delayed, viz.:

α. The lack of true godly fear:

VERS. 9-14.

9 By reason of the multitude of oppressions they make the oppressed to cry:
they cry out by reason of the arm of the mighty.
10 But none saith, "Where is God, my Maker,
who giveth songs in the night;
11 Who teacheth us more than the beasts of the earth,
and maketh us wiser than the fowls of heaven?"
12 There they cry, but none giveth answer,
because of the pride of evil men.
13 Surely God will not hear vanity,
neither will the Almighty regard it.
14 Although thou sayest, thou shalt not see Him,
yet judgment is before Him; therefore trust thou in Him.

β. Dogmatic and presumptuous speeches against God:

VERS. 15, 16.

15 But now, because it is not so, He hath visited in His anger;
yet He knoweth it not in great extremity:
16 Therefore doth Job open his mouth in vain;
he multiplieth words without knowledge.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Of the two charges which Elihu had brought forward against Job at the beginning of his first discourse (ch. xxxiii. 9-11—the one, that he regarded himself as perfectly pure and innocent,—the other, that he accused God of treating him with cruel severity—the former was subjected to particular examination in the first discourse. The three remaining discourses of Elihu are devoted to the examination of the second charge in which Job represents God as a cruel, unjust, and unfriendly persecutor of his innocence, and consequently doubts the justice of God's actions as Ruler of the Universe. Of the two discourses which are here combined together, the *second* (ch. xxxiv.) controverts *Job's denial of the justice of God's conduct*, proving that it is just on the positive side—*a:* from God's absolutely unselfish disinterested love towards His creatures, and *b:* from the conception of God as Ruler of the universe (vers. 10-30), while at the same time on the negative side it assails the folly and self-contradiction of Job in doubting the justice of the God to whom he himself appeals as Supreme Judge (vers. 31 37). The *third* discourse (ch. xxxv.) controverts more particularly *Job's doubt as to the utility of piety*, his tendency, as repeatedly manifested by him, to call it a matter of indifference whether a man's actions were good or bad, seeing that no righteous retribution from God is to be looked for. In opposition to this dangerous error, which ch. xxxiv. 9 had already put forward in all its pernicious force, this discourse maintains *a:* that such an opinion is irrational, and absolutely irreconcilable with God's wonderful greatness (vers. 1-8), and then defines *b:* the true reason why God's righteous and saving activity is so often long delayed, the reason being *α:* that he who is tried by such doubts is often wanting in true godly fear (vers. 9-14); or *β*: that he is guilty of speaking arrogantly and dogmatically against God, as had been the case in particular with Job (vers. 15-16).—These subdivisions coincide for the most part with the single strophes, except that some of the longer divisions contain two and three strophes each.—Against the attempt of Köster and Schlottmann to throw suspicion on the genuineness of chap. xxxv. 1, see below on the passage.

2. *The second discourse:* ch. xxxiv. *a. Opening:* vers. 1-9. **And Elihu began and said**, being incited by Job's silence [hence וַיַּעַן as elsewhere —"and answered"], who had nothing to reply to that which El. had hitherto brought forward. So again in ch. xxxv. 1 (but somewhat differently on the contrary in the introduction of the fourth discourse, ch. xxxvi. 1).

Ver. 2. **Hear, ye wise men, my words.** The "wise and knowing ones" here appealed to (comp. ver. 10, "men of understanding") are neither all in the world capable of forming a judgment (Hirzel), nor the circle of listeners who had gathered around the disputants, *i. e.* to say, all those present with the *exception* of Job and the three, all "impartial experts, whose presence is assumed" (Schlott., Del., Dillm.). There is no reason apparent why Job and the three should be regarded as excluded from the number of the wise men addressed; except that they are included only in so far as they are prepared to lift themselves above their own partisan stand-point to those higher points of view established by Elihu. In other words that which is really wise and intelligent in them is set over against that which is erroneous and in need of correction.

Ver 3. **For the ear trieth words.** Here Elihu's own ear is intended as well as that of the wise men addressed; for it is a trial of the truth in common to which he would summon them by this appeal to the natural capacity of judgment, which man possesses. In regard to *b*, comp. ch. xii. 11. Instead of the form אכל יטעם לו found there, we have here יטעם לאכל: "proves, tastes in order to eat," *i. e.* when it would eat [or gerundive, *vescendo*.]

Ver. 4. **The right would we choose for ourselves;** *i. e.* in the controversy between God and Job we would test, find out, and choose for ourselves that which is right; comp. 1 Thess. v. 21. It is to this testing and choosing *in common* that the "knowing *among ourselves* what is good" in *b* refers.

Vers. 5-9. The special *theme* of the investigation which now follows, accompanied by the expression of Elihu's moral indignation over the fact that Job had been able to put forth such expressions. **For Job has said: I am innocent; yet God has taken away from me my right.** The clause—"I am innocent"—is simply auxiliary or preparatory to what follows. The main emphasis rests on the second proposition, which is taken verbally from ch. xxvii. 2; in like manner as צָדַקְתִּי is taken from ch. xiii. 18 (comp. ch. xxiii. 10; xxvii. 7).

Ver. 6. **In spite of my right I shall lie;** *i. e.* notwithstanding (עַל as in ch. x. 17; xvi. 17) that the right is on my side, I shall still be [accounted] a liar, if I maintain it. Job had not so expressed himself literally; nevertheless comp. the utterances, related in meaning, in ch. ix. 20; xvi. 8. [E. V. "Should I lie against my right?" *i. e.* confess my guilt when I am innocent?—a suitable meaning, but less forcible than the above; and here it is natural to suppose that Elihu would refer to the strongest expressions which Job had used. Instead of the Masoretic אֲכַזֵּב Carey suggests אַכְזָב: "Concerning my right He [God] is a false one." The conjecture however is unnecessary.—E.]. **My arrow is incurable**, *i. e.* the arrow of God's wrath sticking in me, or rather the wound occasioned by the same (comp. ch. vi. 4); this being the case "without transgression," without (בְּלִי as in ch. viii. 11) my having deserved it; comp. ch. xxxiii. 9.

Ver. 7 seq. Sharp rebuke of Job's conduct in thus suspecting the divine justice: **Where is there a man like Job, who drinketh scornful speeches like water?**—Elihu evidently borrows this harsh figurative expression from one of the earlier discourses of Eliphaz (ch. xv. 16), with a considerate limitation however of the charge there brought forward to Job's scorn-

ful and blasphemous *speeches* against God (לַעַג), which really deserved to be rebuked thus harshly, whereas the charge of Eliphaz, that he drank "*iniquity*" (עַוְלָה) as water, besides being urged indirectly and covertly, and so much the more irritatingly, was in its indefinite and general form much less accurate and must for that very reason have inflicted a much more cutting wound. The expression being thus palpably borrowed from that former attack on Job, the charge which from antiquity has been founded on this passage of immoderate violence and bluntness on the part of Elihu, is certainly unmerited (against the Pseudo-Jerome, Gregory the Great, Beda, *etc.*, also Delitzsch).

Ver. 8. **And goes in company** (lit. "to the company") **with evil-doers, and is wont to go about with men of wickedness.** וְלָלֶכֶת, continuation of the finite verb וְאָרַח; comp. Ewald, ℥ 351, c. What is meant is, of course, only that by *blasphemous speeches*, such as might be quoted in the way of example, he lowers himself to the companionship of wicked men (comp. Ps. i. 1 seq.), that accordingly by his frivolous and wanton sins of the tongue he puts himself on a level with the evil world. Elihu does intend an actual participation by Job in the society of evil-doers, as the following verse clearly shows.

Ver. 9. **For he saith: A man hath no profit** (comp. ch. xxii. 2), **if he lives in friendship with God** (lit. "from his having pleasure with God," *i. e.*, in fellowship with God; comp. Ps. l. 18). Job had never expressed himself in this way literally, but he had often uttered this sentiment; *e. g.*, ch. ix. 22 seq.; xxi. 7 seq.; xxiv. 1 seq. But how blameworthy such frivolous utterances were, he himself repeatedly acknowledged (ch. xvii. 9; xxi. 15; xxviii. 28), without however ceasing from them.

Continuation: Proof that God really is righteous in His dispensations: (*a*) from His love to His creatures: vers. 10-15.

Ver. 10. **Therefore men of understanding, hearken to me.** Lit. "men of heart" (LXX. συνετοὶ καρδίας); comp. Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*, p. 293; Beck, *Umriss der bibl. Seelenlehre*, 3d Ed., p. 99. **Far from God be wickedness,** *etc.* חָלִלָה here with מִן of the thing abjured, as in Gen. xviii. 25. In the third member וְשַׁדַּי is used by abbreviation for וּלְשַׁדַּי; comp. ch. xv. 3.

Ver. 11. **Rather** (כִּי, comp. ch. xxxiii. 14) **man's work He recompenseth to him, and according to a man's conduct** (lit. "way") **He causeth it to be with him.** lit. "He causeth it to find him, to overtake him" (הִמְצִיא, only here and ch. xxxvii. 13).

Ver. 12. **Yea verily** (אַף אָמְנָם, as in ch. xix. 4) **God doth not act wickedly,** doth not act as a רשׁע (לֹא יַרְשִׁיעַ). In respect to *b* comp. ch. viii. 3.

Ver. 13. **Who hath delivered over to Him the earth?**—אַרְצָה=אֶרֶץ only here, and ch. xxxvii. 12 [with He paragogic therefore, not directive; see Green, ℥ 61, 6, *a*]. פקד with עַל, of the person and accus. of the thing, denotes: To trust any one with anything, to commit anything to any one, to deliver over to one's charge (πιστεύειν τινά τι); comp. Num. iv. 27; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 23. Without sufficient support from the language Hahn explains: "Who besides (or except Him cares for the earth?" and similarly Ewald: "who investigates the earth against him" [*i. e.*, against man, in order to punish him when necessary]? **And who hath established** (founded, שָׂם as in ch. xxxviii. 5; Isa. xliv. 7) **the whole globe?**—The answer to both these questions is self-evident: "None other than Himself." This reference however to God's independent glory, and to the relation of absolute causality between Him and all that has been created, is made in order to exclude as strongly as possible the thought of any selfish, or unloving conduct whatever on the part of God.

Ver. 14. **If He should set His heart only upon Himself, gather unto Himself** (again) **His spirit and His breath.**—The case here supposed is an impossible one, as ver. 15 shows. The twice-used אֵלָיו refers both times to God as subject, not merely the second time (as Jerome, Targ., Pesh., Grotius, Rosenm., Delitzsch [E. V. Scott, Con., Lee, Noyes] explain). In respect to the withdrawal of His spirit and breath, comp. Ps. civ. 29 seq.; Eccles. xii. 7, in which passages indeed the withdrawal of the divine vital spirit spoken of is not, as here *sudden* and *total*, but that successive and gradual process, which takes place continually in the death of individual creatures. The fact therefore that God does not, as He well might, put an end at once to the independent life of His creatures, but gives to each one of them a respite to enjoy life, this is here brought forward as proof of the disinterested fatherly love, and at the same time of the righteousness of His conduct. ["Elihu says this, to assert God's sovereignty, and the bearing of this on the main argument is, if God be sovereign, and amenable to no superior, then he can have no motive for doing what is otherwise than right. The argument is not unlike that of Abraham, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" and that of St. Paul, "Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance? God forbid, for then how shall God judge the world?" Carey].

4. *Continuation.* The divine justice proved: (*β*) from the conception of God as Ruler of the universe: vers. 16-30.

Ver. 16. **And if there is understanding** (with thee), **then hear this.**—So according to the punctuation of בִּינָה as *Milra*, preferred by the Targ., Pesh., Jer., and in general most of the ancients, as well as the moderns [so E. V.]. If the word be rendered as Imperative, the preceding וְאִם should be taken as an optative particle—"and oh that thou wouldst observe, oh understand now." (Del.). This rendering however is equally destitute of support from the language as the εἰ δὲ μὴ νουθετῇ of the LXX., and various similar renderings. The punctuation of the Masoretes [as *Milel*] is to be explained by their desire to remove the apparent discourtesy and insult implied in the expression—"and if there is understanding with thee." But this by

no means implies a real doubt of Job's intelligence. In regard to *b* comp. ch. xxxiii. 8. **Will even an enemy of the right be able to govern?**—אַף here meaning "even," as in ch. xl. 8 seq., not the object of וחבש: *num iram osor judicii refrenabit* (Schult., Umbr., Welte, *etc.*), against which the position of the words is decisive. Rather is חבש here objectless, meaning to bind, to hold the reins of authority, to govern, (as elsewhere עָצַר, 1 Sam. ix. 17). ["Right and government are indeed mutually conditioned, without right everything would fall into anarchy and confusion." Delitzsch]. **Or wilt thou condemn** (*i. e.*, declare unjust; הרשיע here in its usual sense, differing in this from ver. 12) **the All-just;** lit. "the mighty just One;" comp. Ewald, § 270. *d.*

Ver. 18 seq. He who exercises justice in union with omnipotence is now more particularly described in this aspect of His activity. **Him, who says to a king: Thou worthless one!** So according to the reading הָאֹמֵר, which is attested, not indeed by the Masoretes, but by the LXX. and Vulg., and in favor of which most of the moderns declare (Hirz., Ew., Hahn., Stick., Vaih., Dillm., [Renan, Elz.], *etc.*). The Mas., Targ., Luth., Del. [E. V., Con., Car., Noy., Rod., Ber., Bar., Lee, Schlott.], *etc.*, read הַאֲמֹר, Inf. constr. with הֲ interrogative: "is it (fit) to say to a king—Thou worthless one," *etc.?* But it would be very difficult to connect the clause אֲשֶׁר וגו׳ in ver. 18 with such a question, which would express a *conclusio a min. ad majus* (even to a human king one would not dare to speak thus, *etc.*).

Ver. 19. **Him, who accepteth not the person of rulers** (comp. ch. xxxii. 21), **and knoweth not** (*i. e.*, considers, regards not; concerning נִכַּר see ch. xxi. 29) **the rich before the poor,** *i. e.*, in preference to the poor (comp. ch. viii. 12). God exercises this strict impartiality, because, as the parenthetical clause in *c* explains, His creatures are all of equal worth to Him.

Ver. 20. **In a moment they perish, even at midnight,** *i. e.*, suddenly and unexpectedly, at night, (comp. Ps. cxix. 62; and for the thought ch. xxvii. 19; also below ver. 25). **Their people are shaken and pass away.**—The subject of the verse is those who are expressly mentioned first in the third member as "the strong" or "mighty ones," the same who are specially distinguished in the two preceding verses as kings, princes, rulers and rich men, and who then in ver. 23 seq. become again the principal object of consideration. The clause in *b*, יְגֹעֲשׁוּ עָם, is neither (with Ewald) to be explained "they stagger *in crowds*," nor (with Hirzel and others) "*nations* are shaken." The word עָם admits of neither rendering; in connection with the princes it can signify only their people, their subjects. **And the mighty are removed** (lit. "the mighty one is, *etc.*")—**not by the hand of man,** *i. e.*, without needing to be touched by hand, referring to a higher invisible power as cause; comp. ch. xx. 27; Zech. iv. 6; also the expression of Daniel, בְּאֶפֶס יָד, Dan. viii. 25; comp. ii. 34.

Vers. 21-24 give the reason why such a mighty administration of justice on the part of God is possible, or rather why it actually exists, by calling attention to His *omniscience*. In respect to ver. 21 comp. ch. xxxi. 4; on ver. 22 see ch. xxiv. 13 seq.; Ps. cxxxix. 11 seq.; and parallel passages.

Ver. 23. **For He doth not long regard man;** *i. e.*, He needs not to wait a long time for him, until he submits himself to His judicial examination, because He has him, like all His creatures, continually present before Him. ["A single thought of God, without the uttering of a word, is enough to summon the whole world to judgment. Job had earnestly craved for leave to *enter into judgment* with God (see ch. xiii. 8; xvi. 21; xxiii. 3; xxxi. 35). Elihu replies that God of His own accord, finds out men in a moment, without any effort, and summons them to judgment. Job ought therefore to change his tone, and say, 'Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord, for in Thy sight shall no man living be justified" (Ps. cxliii. 2). Wordsworth]. עוֹד here not "again and again, a long time (Hirzel, Del. [Ber., Bar., Noy., Rod.] *etc.*) [nor "more than right," E. V., Rashi, Wolfsohn, Elzas], but simply, "more, yet, again," as *e. g.*, Is. v. 4, and often.

Ver. 24. Respecting לֹא חֵקֶר, instead of בְּלֹא ח׳, comp. chap. xii. 24; xxxviii. 26. [Pesh. Vulg. E. V. Rod. render "without number:" but the meaning "without inquiry," without undertaking a long process of investigation, is better suited to the context. E.]. In respect to אַחֵר in *b*, see ch. viii. 19; Is. lxv. 15.

Vers. 25-30 recur to the previous description of God's fearful judgments upon the mighty of earth (ver. 18 seq.). **Therefore He knoweth their works.**—לָכֵן, lit. "therefore, on that account," means here "accordingly, and so, hence," as a formula denoting a logical inference from that which precedes; comp. ch. xlii. 3. Rosenmüller, Umbreit erroneously: "Because that He knoweth their works;" for which meaning we should have rather לכן אשר. [Alike incorrect is the rendering "for"—Noyes, Barnes, Rodwell]. מַעְבָּד, only here in Elihu, an Aramaizing word, used interchangeably with מַעֲשֶׂה. **And overthrows them in the night** (*i. e.*, suddenly; comp. ver. 20) **so that they are crushed;** comp. ch. v. 4. From this verb וַיִּדַּכָּאוּ the object of the preceding verb הפך is to be supplied (Prov. xii. 7). The object cannot be לילה, (which is evidently an adverbial specification of time), as Umbreit renders it: "He changes the night," *i. e*, into day.

Ver. 26. **Instead of the wicked He scorns them,** *i. e.*, the mighty; lit. 'He claps, slaps them," ספק as in ver. 37, used metaphorically in the sense of scorning, mocking; comp. the full phrase סָפַק כַּפַּיִם, ch. xxvii. 23. [Vulg., E. V., Rosenm., Del., Con., Car., Noy., *etc.* render the verb "to strike, smite," but less in accordance with the usage].—תַּחַת־רְשָׁעִים does not

mean exactly "in the place of execution of the wicked" (Hirzel), but more "in the stead, after the manner of the wicked" comp. Vulg.: *quasi impios*) [and E. V. "as wicked men"]. **In the place where all see it**; lit. "in the place of those seeing," *i. e.*, publicly, *in propatulo*. [Grotius: ἐθεάτρισεν αὐτοὺς; Cocceius: (1) *cum pudore et ignominia;* (2) *in exemplum*].

Vers. 27-28. **They, who for that reason turn away from Him,** *etc.* עַל־כֵּן points forward to that which follows (comp. ch. xx. 2), and is explained in להביא, and so forth (ver. 28). In order vividly to characterize the insolent, and persistently wicked conduct of evildoers, it is represented as their purpose to continue torturing the oppressed until their cry pierces through the clouds, and as it were compels God to hear it. [If אשר אל־כן be rendered "because" (LXX. E. V. Rosenm., Umbr., Hahn, Con., *etc.*). לחביא will be Inf. epexeget. In that case כִּי=אֲשֶׁר. This however seems a less probable construction than that given above].

Ver. 29 seq. **And if He giveth rest who will condemn** (Him) השקיט, Hiph. of שקט in the sense of Is. xiv. 7; Judg. v. 31, hence "to give rest," *viz.* by resisting and overcoming the violence of mighty tyrants, which drives the poor to cry out for help (comp. Ps. xciv. 13). וְהוּא, referring to God is prefixed for emphasis, as is the case also with וּמִי at the head of the following interrogative sentence, which signifies that it would be impossible to object to that which has been ordained by God, or to condemn it (as *e. g.*, Job had undertaken to do ch. ix. 22 seq.). [This is the meaning of הרשיע favored by all the ancient versions, by usage, and by the parallelism, which suggests God as the object of the verb here, as in *b*. The meaning "to make trouble" (E. V.) is not inappropriate however: and either rendering leads to the same result, to wit, a rest for the oppressed against which oppressors will be impotent]. The structure of the second parallel member is essentially the same: **if He hides His face** (in wrath above those wicked ones)—**who will behold Him,** again find Him graciously disposed? To the clause וַיַּסְתֵּר פָּנִים, from which it is separated only on account of the rhythm, belongs the close specification in the third member, together with the doubled negative statement of the end aimed at in ver. 30: **alike above a people and above man** (יַחַד serving to strengthen the correlation and correspondence expressed by וְ—וְ), **in order that ungodly men might not rule** (מִן=that not; comp. 2 Kings xxiii. 33, K'ri), **not** (מִן by ellipsis, instead of the repetition of מִמְּלֹךְ) **snares of the people**; *i. e*, ungodly misleaders, who would plunge the people into ruin; comp. Ex. x. 7; Hos. v. 1.

5. *Conclusion:* Exhibition of the inconsistency and folly of Job's accusations of the divine righteousness: vers. 31–37.

Vers. 31-32. **For does one say indeed to God—"I expiate without doing evil; what I see not, that show Thou me; if I have done iniquity I will do it no more."**—So (in essential agreement with Schult., Ew., Vaih., Heil. Dillm.) are these two obscure verses to be rendered, which have been variously misunderstood by the ancient versions of expositors. For (1) הֶאָמַר, ver. 31 *a*, can only be 3 Perf. sing. with הֲ interrogative (comp. ch. xxi. 4; Ezek. xxviii. 9), not Imperat. Niph. (=הֵאָמֵר, *dicendum est*), as Rosenm., Schlottm. [E. V. Noy., Con., Rod.], *etc.*, take it. The subject of this interrogative *num dicit* however cannot be the אָדָם חָנֵף of the preceding verses, but is indefinite, any one (comp. ch. xxi. 22; xxx. 24). ["It is observed by Scott that the petition and confession, which Elihu recommends to Job, would be highly improper. for one who knows himself to be guilty of heinous crimes, but highly fit for a person, who though good in the main, has reason to suspect somewhat amiss in his temper and conduct, for which God is displeased with him. It appears plainly that Elihu did not suppose Job to be a *wicked man*, suffering for his oppressions, bribery, inhumanity, and impiety, with which his three friends had charged him." Noyes]. (2) The difficult expression נָשָׂאתִי is most simply understood of the bearing of sins in respect of their punishment, an object which is easily supplied out of the asyndetically added circumstantial clause לֹא אֶחְבֹּל; hence—"I bear (or expiate), without doing evil." (חבל as *e. g.*, Nehem. i. 7; comp. Dan. vi. 23). This rendering of the second member of ver. 31 is, on account of its simplicity, and the established character of the linguistic construction in all its parts, greatly to be preferred to any other, as *e. g.*, to that of Rashi, Merc., Schlottmann [E. V. Noyes, Con., Rod., Bar.], *etc.* "I expiate, I will do evil no more;" of Hirzel—"I bear the yoke of punishment, and will not cast it off;" of Hahn and Delitzsch—"I have been proud, I will do evil no more;" of Kamphausen (who following the LXX. reads נָשָׂאתִי)—"I have practiced oppression, I will take a pledge no more"—LXX.: "I have received (scil. blessings), I will not take a pledge"], *etc.* (3) The elliptical objective clause בלעדי אחזה at the beginning of ver. 32 is according to Ew., § 333 *b* to be explained: "that which lies beyond what I see, teach Thou me;" *i. e.*, that which lies beyond the circle of my vision, that which I do not see, teach Thou me respecting it. By this is meant the errors unknown to the speaker, which in Ps. xix. 13 are called נִסְתָּרוֹת—only that here the person introduced as speaking is not a truly pious and penitent self-observer, like the poet of that Psalm, but one who confesses reluctantly, who regards himself as being, properly speaking, wholly innocent, and who (according to ver. 32) announces himself as ready to repent *only in case* (אם) iniquity should be proved upon him. And on the whole Job had indeed heretofore always expressed himself essentially in this impenitent, rather than in a truly contrite way; comp. ch. vii. 20; xix. 4, *etc.*

Ver. 33. **Should He recompense it to thee according to thy will** (עִם as in מֵעִמָּךְ ch. xxiii 10; xxvii. 11, and often), **that thou hast despised,** *scil.* His usual way of recompensing. The question may also be expressed thus: "Should He allow thy discontented faultfinding, and blaming of His method of retribution to go unpunished, and take up instead with a method corresponding to *thy* way of thinking?" which is equivalent to saying: Should He change the laws of His righteous administration (his *justitia retribuens*) to please thee?—**so that thou must choose, and not I?** *i. e.*, so that *thou* wouldst have to determine the mode of retribution, and not I (God). Instead of אֲנִי we should properly expect הוּא, but Elihu here, after the manner of the prophets, introduces God Himself as speaking, and thus makes himself the organ of God (so correctly Rashi, Rosenm., Ewald, *etc.*). ["The abrupt and bold personation of the Deity in the first person ("and not I") is not unnatural in one who is speaking on behalf of God, and representing his just prerogatives and claims." Con.]. **And what knowest thou then? speak**; *i. e.*, in respect to the only true method of retribution. What more correct knowledge than all others canst thou claim for thyself respecting this obscure province of the divine way of retribution?

On ver. 34 comp. vers. 2 and 10.

Vers. 35-37 contain the speech of the men of understanding, to whose judgment Elihu appeals as agreeing with his own.

Ver. 35. **Job speaks without knowledge, and his words are without wisdom.**—הַשְׂכֵּיל, substant. Inf. absol. Hiph., instead of the usual form הַשְׂכֵּל; so also in Jer. iii. 15.

Ver. 36. **O would that Job were proved continually.**—אָבִי cannot signify "my Father," as though it were an address to God (Vulg., Saad., Luther [Bernard], *etc.*), for in Elihu's mouth, judging by numerous parallels, we should rather look for "my Maker," or "my God;" and the address "my Father" does not once elsewhere throughout the Old Testament proceed from a single person to God, and just here would have but little propriety. [Words. suggests that it may have been addressed by Elihu, as a young man, to Job; which in view of the mention of Job immediately after in the third person, would be singularly harsh]. Hence the word should either (with Targ., Kimchi, Umbr., Schlottm. [E. V.], *etc.*) be derived from a subst. אָבָה, "wish," to be assumed, and to be rendered either "my desire is," or "I desire;" or—which is in any case to be preferred —with Död., Ew., Del., Dillm., be rendered as an interjectional optative particle, synonymous with לוּ, and resting on a root בּוֹא or בּוּי.—Etymologically related are the well known בִּי in the formula בִּי אֲדֹנִי, (*quæso domine*), on the other side the optative interjection, still very common with the Syrian Arabs of Damascus, *abi* (which is formally inflicted *abî, tebî, jebî; nebî, tebû, jebû*); comp. the elaborate and learned discussion of Wetzstein in Delitzsch, p. 431 seq.—In respect to עַד נֶצַח, "continually," or "to the extreme end," comp. the similar לָנֶצַח in ch. xxiii. 7. What Elihu here desires for Job is not that the chastisements inflicted on him should increase in severity, that his sufferings should continually grow more intense (such cruelty would in connection with his mild and friendly treatment of Job elsewhere be simply inconceivable). It is rather that the divine operation of proving his heart and working on his conscience now going on (comp. Ps. cxxxix. 23; also בחן in ch. vii. 18) should be carried on until he had been brought at last to confess his guilt, and to humble himself beneath the hand of God (comp. Brentius, and von Gerlach below, Homiletical Remarks). The reason why Elihu desires that he may thus continue under the influence of the divine process of proving and punishing him,—or more accurately, why he introduces the men of understanding as uttering this wish in what they say, is given in ver. 36 *b* taken together with ver. 37: **on account of his answers after the manner of wicked men** (תְּשֻׁבֹת "replies," *viz.* to the speeches of the friends rebuking him; comp. ch. xxi. 34; בְּ here signifying "in the manner, after the fashion of").

Ver. 37. **Because he addeth to his sin transgression** (*i. e.* by his presumptuous speeches against God) [hence פֶּשַׁע here may be rendered "blasphemy"], **in the midst of us he mocks** ("claps" [his hands in scorn]: see on ver. 26), **and multiplieth his speeches against God.**—יַרְבֶּ, imperf. apoc. Hiph. (as in ch. x. 17) is used instead of the unabbreviated Imperf., like וְתָשֵׂם ch. xiii. 27, instead of וְתָשִׂים, or like יָשֵׁר, ch. xxxiii. 27, *etc.*—לָאֵל, "towards God, against God," refers back both to this יַרְבֶּ and to יִסְפּוֹק; for the mocking is also described as being against God.

6. *The third discourse:* ch. xxxv. *First Half:* The folly of the erroneous notion that piety and ungodliness are alike of little profit: vers. 1-8. In respect to ver. 1, comp. ch. xxxiv. 1. The conjecture of Köster and Schlottmann, that the verse is a later interpolation, because ch. xxxv. gives evidence of being a simple appendage to ch. xxxiv., has no foundation. For with just as good right might ch. xxxiv. also be regarded as a simple appendage to ch. xxxiii., because the theme of this second discourse has also received expression at the beginning of the discourse preceding (ch. xxx. 9 sq.). All four discourses are closely bound together, and ch. xxxiii. 9-11 contains the common point of procedure for all alike (see on the passage).

Vers. 2-3 formulate, in an interrogative form, the special theme of the discourse, as a repetition of that which has already been said (ch. xxxiv. 9).—**Hast thou considered this** (זֹאת pointing forwards to ver. 3) **to be right** (ch. xxxiii. 10), **and spoken of it as "my righteousness before God"** (מִן *coram*, as in ch. iv. 7; xxxii. 2), **that thou sayest, what advantage is it to thee** (סכן as in ch. xxxiv. 9), **"what doth it profit me more than my sin?"**—As frequently with Elihu, the direct interrogation interchanges here with

the indirect (comp. *e. g.* xxxiv. 33). The force of the whole question, moreover, is that of a strong negation: a righteous man speaks *not* thus. [The construction here given of these two verses seems awkward and artificial. Extremely so in particular is it to render אמרת צדקי מאל "(hast thou) defined it as 'my righteousness before God' that thou hast said," *etc.* And besides how can it be said that he had made his saying that there is no profit in holiness a part of his righteousness before God? Here, moreover, it cannot well be denied that the comparative sense of מִן, "my righteousness is more than God's," makes the proposition introduced by אָמַרְתָּ more complete and forcible. Had he designed to say: "I am righteous before God," he would have used the verb צָדַקְתִּי (which Olshausen indeed proposes to read), rather than צִדְקִי. The meaning of the claim which Job had made, according to Elihu, is not that his character was more righteous than that of God, but that his cause, as against God, was more just than that of his Almighty antagonist. In ver. 3 Elihu gives the proof, or rather the specification in support of his charge. Job had denied that there was any profit in holiness:—in other words he had charged God with indifference to moral character in his treatment of men. The rendering of E. V. is to be preferred except in the last clause, where מִן is again comparative, and which should be rendered, not —"what profit shall I have if I be cleansed from my sin?" but—"what profit shall I have more than by my sin?"—E.]

Ver. 4. **I will answer thee words** (comp. ch. xxxiii. 32), **and thy companions with thee,** *i. e.* Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar, who have shown themselves incompetent to contend with thee effectively, and who deserve to be reprimanded together with thee (עִמָּךְ). We are scarcely to render עִמָּךְ (with Dillmann, *etc.*), "who are with thee." Still more impossible is it to understand by רֵעִים not the three friends, but all others associated with Job in sentiment and character, the אנשי עון of ch. xxxiv. 8, 36 (Umbr., Heil., Vaih., Del.), for רֵעִים constantly denotes throughout the book the three friends of Job (ch. ii. 11; xix. 21; xxxii. 3; xlii. 7).

Vers. 5-8. Refutation of the ensnaring proposition that it is useless to be pious by calling attention to God's blessed self-sufficiency in His heavenly exaltation, the contemplation of which shows that of necessity man only can derive profit from his righteousness (a thought which had been already expressed by Job himself, ch. vii. 20; and by Eliphaz, ch. xxii. 2 seq.).

Ver. 5. **Look up to heaven, and see,** *etc.* —In the same way that Zophar (ch. xi. 7 seq.) points Job to the height of the heavenly vault, and its loftiest luminous fleece-like clouds (which is what שְׁחָקִים means here, not precisely a synonym of "heaven," or of the "ether," as Vaihinger, Delitzsch, *etc.*, say), in order to illustrate God's absolute exaltation above the world.

On ver. 6 seq. comp. ch. vii. 20; xxii. 2 seq.

Ver. 8. **To man like thee thy wickedness availeth** (*i. e.* it produces its effects on him), **and for a son of man thy righteousness.**—By the "son of man" Job himself, or one of his kind, is again intended. The expression serves to set forth their need of help, and frailty in contrast with the exaltation and blessedness of God.

7. *Continuation and close.—Second Half:* The true reason why sufferers remain for a long time unheard, to wit: *a.* Their lack of genuine reverence for God; *b.* The presumptuousness of their speeches against God.

a. Vers. 9-14. **On account of the multitude of oppressions they cry out, they wail because of the violence** (lit. "because of the arm," זְרוֹעַ as in ch. xxii. 8) **of the mighty** (רַבִּים here in another sense than in ch. xxxii. 9). The Hiph. יַזְעִיקוּ in the sense of Kal, or as intensive of Kal (comp. ch. xix. 7; xxxi. 18) [not Hiphil proper, "they make the oppressed to cry," (E. V.) which is unsuitable in connection with מֵרֹב עֲשׁ׳]. עֲשׁוּקִים, "oppressions," as in Am. iii. 9; Eccles. iv. 1.

Ver. 10 seq. introduce the refutation of this objection [contained in ver. 9, to wit, that oppression goes unpunished, hence that the wicked fare no worse than the righteous], by calling attention to the guilt of the suffering. **But they do not say** (as they could say)—**Where is Eloah my creator?** This is the question asked by those who seek God (comp. Jer. ii. 6, 8). עֹשָׂי intensive plur., as in Is. xxii. 11; liv. 5; Ps. cxlix. 2. **Who giveth songs in the night;** *i. e.*, by granting sudden and wonderful deliverance (comp. ch. xxxiv. 25).

Ver. 11. **Who teaches us more than the beasts of the earth**—not "by them, as our mute instructors" (Hahn, Delitzsch), but with a comparative rendering of מִן, "in preference to the beasts, esteeming us worthy of higher honor and blessing than they." The form מַלְּפֵנוּ is either an error of transcription, or syncopated from מְאַלְּפֵנוּ; comp. אַלֶּף in ch. xv. 5. On *b* comp. ch. xii. 7, where in like manner the mention of the birds of heaven is parallel to that of the beasts of the field. [A pregnant passage. The instinctive cry of distress for relief is not the prayer which God requires. The former goes up from the brute creature (comp. Ps. civ. 21; Joel i. 20; Ps. cxlix. 9); man's prayer should be worthy of a rational being, should proceed from the recognition of God the creator, and from gratitude for His interposition in our behalf in the night of calamity. If (as he proceeds to show) man's prayers are not heard, it is because they are too much the cry of animal instinct, not the outpouring of the heart, conscious of its wants, of God, and of His goodness.—E.].

Ver. 12. **There cry they—but He answers not** (or: "without indeed God's answering them")—**on account of the pride of the evil.**—Respecting the construction of the verb צעק with מִפְּנֵי, "before," or "on account of," comp. Is. xix. 20. [It seems most natural to put מפני here in close connection with יענה, "He will not answer" (so as to save them) from the

force of wicked men. To make the pride of the oppressors the reason why God refuses to hear the oppressed, although the affirmation in itself might be made, would be out of harmony here. The reason as Elihu more explicitly declares in ver. 13 is *in the oppressed themselves.*—E.].

Ver. 13. The reason why God does not hear those oppressed when they cry: **Only vanity** (*i. e.*, nothingness, empty, fruitless complaining [with אַךְ restrictive—"that which is only emptiness, that crying which has no heart in it"]) **God heareth not**—but on the other hand (for this is the unspoken antithesis) He doth hear the righteous, pious prayer. **And the Almighty regardeth it not**—*viz.*, that crying and complaining. The neut. suffix in יְשׁוּרֶנָּה does not refer to the masc. שָׁוְא, but to the crying spoken of in the preceding verse. Respecting שׁוּר "to behold, observe," comp. ch. xxxiii. 14.

Ver. 14. **Much less then** (would He hear thee) **when thou sayest: thou beholdest Him not**; *i. e.*, He intentionally withdraws himself from thee; comp. ch. xxiii. 8 seq. In respect to אַף כִּי *quanto minus* (here more precisely *quanto minus si*, comp. ch. iv. 19; ix. 14; Ezek. xv. 5. Neither the language nor the context justifies the rendering of Schlottmann and Delitzsch [also E. V.], who take אַף כִּי to mean "although," *etiamsi*, which moreover receives no support from Nehem. ix. 18. **The cause lies before Him, and thou waitest** (in vain) **on Him**;—this being the continuation of the indirect address begun in *a.*—דִּין (instead of which elsewhere we have רִיב), "the cause in controversy, the case on trial," as also חוֹלֵל "to wait" (instead of which elsewhere יִחֵל), are both expressions peculiar to Elihu. Hirzel, Schlottmann, Delitzsch [E. V. Scott, Noyes, Barnes, Words., Ren., Rod.], *etc.*, render this second member as an admonition to Job—"the controversy lies certainly before God, but thou shouldst calmly await His decision." But this is rendered impossible by the tone of stern censure in ver. 15 seq. Still more out of the question (on account of לְפָנָיו) is the rendering of Ewald who takes תְּשׁוּרֶנּוּ and תְּחוֹלֵל as addressed to God.

β.—vers. 15-16. The complaint of Job, above cited, in respect to God's assumed withdrawal and concealment of Himself, gives Elihu occasion to refer to Job's *presumptuous and dogmatic speeches* as another reason for his being unheard. **And now, because His anger has not yet punished** (lit. "because there is not [or nothing], which His anger has punished [visited]; *i. e.*, because His anger has not yet interposed to punish—comp. Ew., § 321, b), **should He not nevertheless be well acquainted with presumption?**—In respect to מְאֹד with יָדַע comp. Ps. cxxxix. 14, and respecting בְּ in the sense of "about" (to know about anything), comp. above, ch. xii. 9.—פַּשׁ, instead of which the LXX. and Vulg. read פֶּשַׁע, seems to signify, according to the Arabic, "arrogance, presumption," possibly also "foolishness" (the same with תִּפְלָה used elsewhere); scarcely however "multitude, mass," as the Rabbis explain [nor "extremity," as E. V. renders it]. The word is intended to designate Job's presumptuous, intemperate speeches against God. The passage is in substance correctly rendered by Ewald, Delitzsch and Dillmann,—only that the last named conjectures *b* to be a free citation from Job's former discourses (say from ch. xxiv. 12), and thus needlessly obscures the explanation of the verse (to the extent that he conjectures either a corruption of the word פַּשׁ, or the loss of two half verses from between *a* and *b*. The commentators follow different constructions of the passage, which in some particulars vary greatly among themselves, but which are largely agreed in taking ver. 15 as protasis, and ver. 16 as apodosis: on the basis of which construction Hahn *e. g.* translates: "Especially now, because He (God) does not have regard for his (Job's) anger, and does not trouble himself about wicked arrogance, Job opens, *etc.*," (and so Kamph.; while Rosenm., Stick., Hirz., Schlottm., [Carey, with others who take פשׁ in the sense of "transgression," as, *e. g.*, Conant, Noyes, Barnes, Rodwell, Renan] take אַפּוֹ in ver. 15 *a* as subj. and understand by it *God's* anger. But ver. 16 cannot be the apodosis of ver. 15, partly because of the way the subject וְאִיּוֹב is prefixed, and partly because the thought is rather the delivery of a final judgment in respect to the whole manner of Job's appearance: **But Job opens his mouth in vain** (*i. e.*, uselessly, to no purpose; הֶבֶל as in ch. ix. 29; xxi. 34), **and unintelligently multiplieth words.**—The "opening of the mouth" is not mentioned here as a gesture of scorn (as *e. g.*, in Lam. ii. 16; iii. 46), but, as explained by the second member, as a symbol or means of unintelligent babbling and loquacity. הִכְבִּיר here and ch. xxxvi. 31 =הִרְבָּה, (ch. xxxiv. 37).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The many points of contact between the two discourses here considered and those of the three friends, especially in the words of blame and reproof addressed to Job have furnished those expositors in ancient and modern times, whose judgment respecting Elihu has been in general unfavorable, with abundant material for their disparaging judgments, and their attacks. That Elihu is a servile imitator, a mere reproducer and compiler of what has been said by previous speakers; that in repeating he weakens in many ways the statements of his predecessors; that he cites Job's expressions, when he would controvert them, inaccurately, or in such a way as altogether to distort them; that he endeavors to surpass the three friends in the intemperate severity of his attacks on Job, *etc.*, these and the like are the unfavorable judgments of the critics from the pseudo-Jerome, Gregory, and Bede, down to Dillmann, and indeed even more considerate and favorably disposed critics fall in, at least in part, with this tone of remark. Thus Delitzsch asserts, at least in respect to ch. xxxvii., that the absence, in this

third discourse of Elihu, of the "bold original figures" of the previous discourses, indicates on the part of this discourse as compared with the remainder of the poem "a deficiency of skill, as now and then between Koheleth and Solomon;" that not one of its thoughts is, strictly speaking, new, that, on the contrary, in one chief thought we have simply the repetition of what was said in a previous discourse of Eliphaz, to wit, that the piety of the pious profits himself; in the other—to wit, that the pious, in his necessity, does not put forth useless cries, but lifts himself in prayer to God—a repetition of what Job had said in his last discourse, ch. xxvii. 9 seq. But nevertheless Delitzsch is obliged to admit that "Elihu deprives these thoughts of their hitherto erroneous application." He is constrained to acknowledge that the quickened consciousness of sin and guilt, which Elihu in this discourse occasions for Job, is perfectly in place, and must touch Job's heart, especially in so far as it teaches him to seek the cause of his long-continued sufferings, and of the failure of his prayers hitherto to be heard *in himself*, in the inadequacy of his own purity and piety, in his lack of true submissiveness to God's righteous decree—and not in any severity on the part of God. And still more favorable is his judgment respecting the value of the argument in his second discourse, directed principally against Job's presumptuous doubt of the divine justice; respecting which he acknowledges that "Elihu does not here coincide with what has been already said (especially ch. xii. 15 seq.), without applying it to another purpose; and that his theodicy differs essentially from that proclaimed by the friends. It is not derived from mere appearance, but lays hold of the very principles. It does not attempt the explanation of the many apparent contradictions to retributive justice which outward events manifest, as agreeing with it; it does not solve the question by mere empiricism, but from the idea of the Godhead and its relation to the world, and by such inner necessity guarantees to the mysteries still remaining to human short-sightedness their future solution" (II., p. 266, comp. p. 276). When we see one of the weightiest opponents of the genuineness of the whole Elihu-section stripping of all its force and value that charge against these two chapters which is most frequently brought forward, and most persistently urged, the complaint that it is deficient in originality, and that its character is simply that of a compilation and reproduction, we shall not find it difficult to reply to the remaining objections made to the inward value and authenticity of the two discourses. As regards (*a*) the absence of ornament, the lack of original figures and similes which Del. urges as an objection, at least so far as ch. xxxv. is concerned, it may be very much questioned whether the poet himself did not intend this as a characteristic of the utterances of Elihu here, whether, that is, this unadorned simplicity does not on the one side render effective support to that which Elihu has to say against Job's intemperate speeches, greatly increasing its impressiveness, its power to speak to the heart, and to quicken the conscience, while, on the other side, it is intended to form a contrast to the final discourse which follows (ch. xxxvi.-xxxvii.), in which the wealth of picturesque illustration, bold imagery, and artistic rhetorical turns, which are characteristic of the book elsewhere, reappears in higher measures, and in a way which quite eclipses the splendor of the art of figurative representation as exercised by the preceding speakers. In other words, it may be questioned, whether it is not the poet's purpose to introduce Elihu, *the preacher of repentance*, as speaking as plainly, simply, and with as little art as possible, but on the contrary to introduce Elihu, *the inspired eulogist and glorifier of God*, as surpassing the former speakers in the power, loftiness and adornment of his discourse, nay, even as rivalling in this respect the representation of Jehovah himself. (*b*) As regards the assertion that Elihu quotes those utterances of Job, which he opposes, incorrectly, and so as to distort them, this is by no means the case, as a close comparison of the quotations in question not only with similar utterances of Job's or with such as are verbally identical, but also with the *meaning* of his language, teaches, and as the exegesis of the particular passages has already shown.

And finally (*c*): that Elihu here exhibits himself as still more inconsiderate and intemperate, in his censure of Job than the three friends, rests on the misinterpretation of particular passages which, when rightly judged according to their connection, reveal Elihu as being mildly disposed toward the person of his opponent. So in particular that passage, harsh in some respects, which he has borrowed from the second discourse of Eliphaz, and subjected to a peculiar modification, where he speaks of "drinking scorn like water" (ch. xxxiv. 8 seq., see on the passage). So again the wish, uttered at the close of the second discourse (or rather put in the mouth of certain men, who are there introduced as speaking), that Job "might be continually proved to the end," in respect to which the necessary remarks have already been made in explaining the passage. So again the strong language at the close of ch. xxxv. the severity of which is due simply to the circumstance that Elihu here gives expression to his indignation against that which was really most objectionable and criminal in Job, his presumptuous and intemperate speeches against God, as a cruel, unsympathizing Being. There is scarcely one of the objections which in these respects have been made to the discourses of Elihu, particularly the two discourses before us, which may not, with apparently equal justice, be urged against the concluding discourses of God, in which we also find a repetition of much of the thought in the previous chief divisions (the same being cited in part literally, in part freely), and in which Job's fundamental moral fault, the arrogance and insolent presumption of his heart against God, is just as energetically arraigned, without for that reason occasioning any reasonable doubts touching the genuineness and originality of that section.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The practical and homiletic material, which these two intermediate discourses furnish, is

small, compared with that which may be found in many other sections. Nevertheless the treatment of the two fundamental thoughts—that God deals righteously, notwithstanding all appearances to the contrary—and that true piety is always and infallibly blessed—gives rise to many thoughts of peculiar theological and moral value, showing that these two chapters are mines of genuine revealed wisdom, and that they furnish much wholesome stimulus.

Particular Passages.

Ch. xxxiv. 1 (xxxv. 1): VICT. ANDREÄ: From this point on Job learns before all else *to be silent.* Without saying a word, he simply takes believingly to heart whatever is now made clear to him. In this way he really becomes another man than he has been heretofore, so that at last, because his frame of mind is become truly acceptable to God, he is ready to be completely delivered from his suffering, and to be doubly blessed by God.

Ch. xxxiv. 2 seq. BRENTIUS (on ver. 3): No man, however spiritual, has the right to judge the Word of God, but only the word of man, *i. e.*, to determine whether what men teach, declare, and decree, is the word of God. *E. g.*, Christ shed His blood for our sins—it is permitted to no men to sit in judgment on this saying, but it is the duty of all men to yield themselves captive to this saying, and to believe it. In the meanwhile however many persons put forth many and various opinions in respect to this saying, *etc.*—ZEYSS: We are to use our ears and mouth not only for the necessities of the body, but also for those of the soul, first of all however that we may hear and speak God's word. . . We are to prove and to judge whether that which is spoken be right or wrong, in accordance with God's Word, or not in accordance with it.

Ch. xxxiv. 12 seq. v. GERLACH: In what belongs to another it is possible for one to do injustice; but if God should do injustice to any one, He would injure Himself, destroy His own property, for all is His. A profound, a lofty thought! No one can conscientiously belie himself, do justice to himself. All that we call injustice becomes possible only because man has his equal as a free being beside himself, and has to do with the property of others on earth. This (injustice) is impossible with God, just for the reason that all belongs to Him.—ANDREÄE: In opposition to Job's assertion, that it is of no profit to a man with God to live a pious life, Elihu maintains calmly and firmly the irrefragable truth—that both the *holiness* of God, which excludes every thought of tyranny, and His *justice*, which always renders to each one his own, yea even and His *love*, by which He maintains the whole world in existence, belong inseparably to the divine nature itself, so that Job's speeches condemn themselves.

Ch. xxxiv. 20 seq. STARKE (according to the *Weim. Bib.*, and Cramer): God has power enough to bring the proud and the mighty to the punishment which is meet for them. The raging of all His foes is vain: God can destroy them quickly. He knows our need, however, and gives close attention to it.—ANDREÄE: God does not need to institute long inquiries respecting the sins of men; He has immediate knowledge of all that they do, and executes His mighty judgments, without needing the help of men. . . . *He punishes or spares*, as He may think best in His unsearchable Power and Wisdom.

Ch. xxxiv. 36 seq. BRENTIUS: Elihu does not imprecate any evil on Job, but asks that he may be led to the acknowledgment of his own blasphemy, a result which can be brought about only by the cross and afflictions. Hence when he prays that he may be afflicted (crucified) unto the end, he at the same time prays that he may repent, for affliction (the cross) is the school of repentance.—v. GERLACH: God is asked to prove and to search out Job "even to the end," *i. e.*, most deeply and thoroughly. Not that Elihu supposes him to be guilty of such sins as the friends had conjectured in his case; but he nevertheless misses in him the profound perception of secret sins, and wishes for him accordingly what the Psalmist wishes for himself (Ps. cxxxix. 23).

Ch. xxxv. 9 seq. BRENTIUS: May we not infer that God is present with us and that He favors us, in that "*prona cum spectent animalia cetera terram, Os homini sublime dedit, cœlumque videre, Jussit et erecto ad cidera tollere vultus.*" For when He made the beasts and birds ἄλογα, He created us men so that we might be wise, endowed with reason, and lords of creation. Who then, pondering these things deeply in his mind, would not in affliction call upon the Lord, or hope for His aid?—WOHLFARTH: We must above all things show ourselves thankful for the spiritual endowments with which God has distinguished man (above all the beasts), by cultivating them with the utmost diligence, and by using them for God's glory, and for the salvation of the world.—ANDREAE: God can cause a joyous song of jubilee to spring forth out of the deepest night of suffering, provided we only understand His gracious purposes. All of these tend to the same end, to lift us men to something better and higher than the brute, which knows not God. But presumptuous cries and empty prayers will never find a hearing with God.

FOURTH DISCOURSE.

A vivid exhibition of the activity of God, which is seen to be benevolent, as well as mighty and just, both in the destinies of men, and in the natural world outside of man.

CHAPS. XXXVI—XXXVII.

Introduction: announcing that further important contributions are about to be made to the vindication of God.

CHAPTER XXXVI. 1-4.

1 Elihu also proceeded and said:

2 Suffer me a little, and I will show thee
that I have yet to speak on God's behalf.
3 I will fetch my knowledge from afar,
and will ascribe righteousness to my Maker.
4 For truly my words shall not be false;
he that is perfect in knowledge is with thee.

a. Vindication of the divine justice, manifesting itself in the destinies of men as a power benevolently chastening and purifying them: vers. 5-21.

α. In general: vers. 5-15.

5 Behold God is mighty, and despiseth not any;
He is mighty in strength and wisdom.
6 He preserveth not the life of the wicked;
but giveth right to the poor.
7 He withdraweth not his eyes from the righteous;
but with kings are they on the throne;
yea, He doth establish them forever, and they are exalted.

8 And if they be bound in fetters,
and be holden in cords of affliction;
9 then He sheweth them their work,
and their transgressions that they have exceeded.
10 He openeth also their ear to discipline,
and commandeth that they return from iniquity.
11 If they obey and serve Him,
they shall spend their days in prosperity,
and their years in pleasures.
12 But if they obey not, they shall perish by the sword,
and they shall die without knowledge.

13 But the hypocrites in heart heap up wrath;
they cry not when He bindeth them.
14 They die in youth,
and their life is among the unclean.
15 He delivereth the poor in his affliction
and openeth their ears in oppression.

β. In Job's change of fortune in particular: vers. 16-21.

16 Even so he would have removed thee out of the strait
into a broad place, where there is no straitness;
and that which should be set on thy table should be full of fatness.

17 But thou hast fulfilled the judgment of the wicked;
judgment and justice take hold on thee.
18 Because there is wrath, beware lest He take thee away with His stroke;
then a great ransom cannot deliver thee.
19 Will He esteem thy riches? no, not gold,
nor all the forces of strength.
20 Desire not the night,
when people are cut off in their place.
21 Take heed, regard not iniquity:
for this hast thou chosen rather than affliction.

b. Vindication of the divine justice, revealing itself in nature as supreme power and wisdom;

CHAPS. XXXVI. 22—XXXVII. 24.

a. The wonders of nature, as revelations of divine wisdom and power:

VERSE 22—CHAPTER XXXVII. 13.

22 Behold, God exalteth by His power;
who teacheth like Him?
23 who hath enjoined Him His way?
or who can say, Thou hast wrought iniquity?
24 Remember that thou magnify His work,
which men behold.
25 Every man may see it;
man may behold it afar off.

(1) Rain, clouds, and thunder: verse 26—ch. xxxvii. 5.

26 Behold, God is great, and we know Him not,
neither can the number of His years be searched out.
27 For He maketh small the drops of water;
they pour down rain according to the vapour thereof;
28 which the clouds do drop,
and distil upon man abundantly.
29 Also can any understand the spreading of the clouds,
or the noise of His tabernacle?

30 Behold, He spreadeth His light upon it,
and covereth the bottom of the sea.
31 For by them judgeth He the people;
He giveth meat in abundance.
32 With clouds He covereth the light;
and commandeth it not to shine by the clouds that cometh betwixt.
33 The noise thereof showeth concerning it,
the cattle also concerning the vapour.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

1 At this also my heart trembleth,
and is moved out of his place.
2 Hear attentively the noise of His voice,
and the sound that goeth out of His mouth,
3 He directeth it under the whole heaven,
and His lightning unto the ends of the earth.
4 After it a voice roareth:
He thundereth with the voice of His excellency;
and He will not stay them when His voice is heard.
5 God thundereth marvellously with His voice;
great things doeth He, which we cannot comprehend.

(2) **The forces of winter, such as snow, rain, the north-wind, frost, *etc.*: vers. 6-13.**

6 For He saith to the snow: Be thou on the earth;
likewise to the small rain,
and to the great rain of His strength.
7 He sealeth up the hand of every man;
that all men may know His work.
8 Then the beasts go into dens,
and remain in their places.
9 Out of the south cometh the whirlwind;
and cold out of the north.
10 By the breath of God frost is given;
and the breadth of the waters is straitened.
11 Also by watering He wearieth the thick cloud;
He scattereth His bright cloud;
12 and it is turned round about by His counsels;
that they may do whatsoever He commandeth them
upon the face of the world in the earth.
13 He causeth it to come, whether for correction,
or for His land, or for mercy.

β. Final admonitory inferences from what precedes for Job: **vers. 14-24.**

14 Hearken unto this, O Job; stand still,
and consider the wondrous works of God.
15 Dost thou know when God disposed them,
and caused the light of His cloud to shine?
16 Dost thou know the balancings of the clouds,
the wondrous works of Him which is perfect in knowledge?
17 How thy garments are warm,
when He quieteth the earth by the south wind?
18 Hast thou with Him spread out the sky,
which is strong, and as a molten looking-glass?
19 Teach us what we shall say unto Him;
for we cannot order our speech by reason of darkness.
20 Shall it be told Him that I speak?
if a man speak, surely he shall be swallowed up.

21 And now men see not the bright light
which is in the clouds:
but the wind passeth, and cleanseth them.
22 Fair weather cometh out of the north:
with God is terrible majesty.
23 Touching the Almighty, we cannot find Him out.
He is excellent in power and in judgment,
And in plenty of justice; He will not afflict.
24 Men do therefore fear Him:
He respecteth not any that are wise of heart.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Instead of the predominantly *anthropological and ethical doctrine* of the three preceding discourses, Elihu puts forth, in this his closing discourse, reflections which are *pre-eminently theological.* God, the infinitely mighty and wise Being, who is at the same time just, and possessed of fatherly love, stands in the foreground of his descriptions, alike in the first and shorter division (ch. xxxvi. 5-21), which describes His righteous interposition in determining the lots of mankind, and gives further expression to the favorite thought of the speaker touching the hand of God chastising men with severity indeed, and yet ever with a merciful purpose, and in the second division, which is twice as long (ch. xxxvi. 22 to ch. xxxvii. 24), which treats of the majestic manifestation of God's activity in the wonders of His creation, first in the way of description (ch. xxxvi. 22 to ch. xxxvii. 13) then in the way of application, closing with admonitory inferences from the themes of his description for the benefit of Job. It is in this last half especially that this fourth discourse of Elihu ex-

hibits itself as the immediate preparation for the concluding act of the whole poem, providing the transition to the interposition of God. This magnificent physico-theological section is vividly introduced by the threefold הֵן at the head of each of the three strophes—ch. xxxvi. 22 seq.; 26 seq.; 30 seq.; and this threefold successive הֵן compels us to find the beginning of this section in ver. 22, and not (with Ewald, Vaihinger, Dillm., *etc.*) in ver. 26 (see below on ver. 22). Add to this the predominance throughout the description of the references to the majestic phenomena of lightning, thunder, storm and rain, and the conjecture formerly adopted by Cocceius, J. H. Michaelis, Reimarus, Starke, Lange, and latterly by Rosenmüller, Umbreit, v. Gerlach, V. Andreä, Schlottmann, Böttcher [Scott, Noyes, Barnes, Bernard, Carey] becomes probable, that the poet conceived that thunder-storm out of which he represents God as speaking to Job, ch. xxxviii. 1 sq. *as already beginning during this last discourse of Elihu, and furnishing him in many particulars with the occasion and material for his descriptions.* This is a hypothesis, which, as we shall see, serves to give essential help in understanding not a few of the details of the splendid description—granting that the absence of *definite historical data* in the text of our book, or in the most ancient exegetical tradition makes it impossible that it should be regarded as more than a probability.

2. *The Introduction:* Ch. xxxvi. 1-4: An announcement that further, and yet more important instruction is about to be communicated respecting the nature and operations of God (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 31).—**And Elihu continued and spoke.**—This new introductory formula, compared with ch. xxxiv. 1 and ch. xxxv. 1, is intended to intimate that a long silence on the part of Job did not this time precede. [ויסף not ויען, as hitherto, because in ch. xxxv. Job was not summoned to speak. Dillmann. "Elihu had spoken three times, *i. e.*, as many times as any of the other friends, but Job does not reply, and he proceeds. The silence of Job, who had replied to every speech of the three friends, is a proof that Job was conscious that Elihu had reason on his side, and is an answer to those who disparage Elihu." Wordsworth].

Ver. 2. **Wait for me a little, and I will teach thee**; *i. e.*, hear my instructions only a little while longer (not: "let me first collect my thoughts a little;" Hirzel). זְעֵיר = מְעַט, used also in Is. xxviii. 10, 13. כַּתַּר, Aramaic, equivalent to the Hebr. הוֹחִיל, *expectare.*—**For there are yet words** (to be said) **for Eloah**: *i. e.*, for I know of something still further, and yet better to say in justification of Eloah (לאלוה, *Dat. commodi*) than what has been said hitherto.

Ver. 3. **I will fetch my knowledge** (comp. ch. xxxvii. 16) **from afar.**—לְמֵרָחוֹק, as in ch. xxxix. 29, and Isa. xxxvii. 26, "from afar," *altius repetendo* (Merc.) ["out of the wide realm of history and nature." Del.]. Elihu has already in mind the wonders of the Divine government in nature and in history, in view of which he will praise God's righteousness (lit. "give [= ascribe] right to his Maker") [פֹּעֲלִי so used only here]. Hence these expressions, which involve no empty self-praise, but have their basis in the inspiring greatness of the object to be described.

Ver. 4. **For one faultless in knowledge,** [lit. **knowledges**] **stands before thee**; *i. e.*, one who has studied and learned to know God's greatness in His works, one who is penetrated with the sense of the Divine exaltation, and who for that reason is raised above the danger of going astray, or speaking falsehood. תְּמִים דֵּעוֹת here cannot signify "an honest thinker" (Hirzel, and many of the older commentators) for in ch. xxxvii. 16 it [תְּמִים דֵּעִים] is used of the perfect knowledge of God. ["As Elihu there attributes absolute perfection of knowledge in every direction to God, so here, in reference to the theodicy which he opposes to Job, he claims faultlessness and clearness of perception." Del.] The Vulg. renders correctly as to the meaning: *et perfecta scientia probabitur tibi.*

3. *First Division:* Proof of God's righteous dealings in allotting *the destinies of men*: *a.* In general: vers. 5-15 (three short strophes: vers. 5-7; 8-12; 13-15).

Ver. 5. **Behold God is mighty, yet He disdaineth nothing.**—וְלֹא יִמְאָס, objectless, as in ch. xlii. 6; comp. ch. viii. 20. The meaning is, although He is exalted in power (כַּבִּיר as in ch. xxxiv. 17), He nevertheless does not disdain to interest Himself even in the smallest of His creatures, and to maintain its right inviolate (comp. vers. 6, 7).—**Mighty is He in strength of understanding** (lit. "of heart," לֵב as in ch. xxxiv. 34), *i. e.*, in the possession of an all-embracing intellectual energy, by virtue of which He sees through right and wrong everywhere, and orders everything in the highest wisdom; comp. ch. xii. 13.

Ver. 6. **He preserveth not the ungodly in life.**—Comp. ch. xxxiv. 19 seq., as also Job's presumptuous assertion of the contrary in ch. xxiv. 22 seq., against which Elihu here declares himself. [**But He will grant the right of the afflicted**].

Ver. 7 continues the affirmation of ver. 6 *b.*—**And** (even) **with kings on the throne** (comp. Ps. ix. 5 [4] **He makes them** (*i. e.*, the righteous, or "the afflicted" of ver. 6 *b*, for both conceptions here flow together into *one*) **to sit down forever, so that they are exalted.**—Comp. the parallel passages as to thought—ch. v. 11; 1 Sam. ii. 8; Ps. cxiii. 7, *etc.* Inasmuch as the particular point respecting which we should look for something to be said here is how *widely* God's care for His people extends, how *high* He can exalt them, the rendering of the Vulg. and of Luther—"who makes kings to sit on the throne"—is unsuitable, as also that of Ewald, which suffers besides from too great artificiality: "Kings for the throne, *i. e.*, who merit the throne, He makes to sit down, *etc.*"

Vers. 8-12 constitute a single period, which develops the thought, that if God subjects to suffering His righteous ones (who continue to be

the logical subject here, not "the ungodly," as Hahn thinks), He does this with a view to their chastisement and purification—**But if they are bound with chains** (זִקִּים to be understood figuratively; comp. ver. 13), **holden in cords of distress**; comp. ch. xiii. 27; Isa. xxviii. 22; Ps. cvii. 10 seq.

Vers. 9, 10 are with Tremellius, Cocceius, Schultens, Ewald, Dillmann, *etc.*, to be construed as still belonging to the protasis; the apodosis begins with יְכַלּוּ, in ver. 11 *b*, the first verb in the whole long series which stands without וְ *consecut.*, and is by that very fact marked as introducing the apodosis. [Most commentators, (and so E. V.), introduce the apodosis with the beginning of ver. 9. But in addition to the argument from the use of the *Vav. consec.*, it would seem to be more in harmony with Elihu's conception, which *unites* the discipline with the suffering, to take the entire process described in vers. 8-10 as *one* hypothesis, finding its consequent in ver. 11 *b*.—E.]—**And He declareth to them their doing.**—פָּעַל, *maleficium*, evil-doing, like מַעֲשֶׂה, ch. xxxiii. 17.—**And their transgressions, that** (כִּי, *quod* objective) **they act proudly** (יִתְגַּבָּרוּ, lit. to show themselves strong, *i. e.* in opposing God): "exceeded," E. V. is ambiguous, the intransitive use of it being rare.—E.]. In respect to "the opening of the ear for instruction" (ver. 10 *a*), comp. ch. xxxiii. 16, where the rarer form מֹסָר is used instead of the usual form מוּסָר found here. [Lit. "to *the* instruction," that which forms the design of the chastisement.]—**And commandeth them to turn** (lit. "saith to them, that they turn") **from vanity.**—אָוֶן, emptiness, nothingness, referring to the manifold sins of infirmity into which man easily falls, even when the essential spirit of his heart is holy, the taints proceeding from daily contact with the vain world (comp. John xiii. 10 seq.; 1 John i. 9 seq.; ii. 16), by reason of which the purifying discipline of God becomes necessary.

Vers. 11, 12: double apodosis to the antecedent propositions contained in vers. 8–10, expressed by means of two subordinate antecedent conditional clauses, introduced by אִם, together with the consequents corresponding to each. This construction, which partially reminds us of ch. viii. 5 seq., was necessary, because, where disciplinary suffering is divinely appointed, the result in every case involves a two-fold possibility—either that the one who is chastised should humble himself, and be made better, or that he should continue presumptuously to resist.—In respect to עָבַד, "to humble himself, to submit, to betake himself to obedience," comp. 1 Kings xii. 7; Mal. iii. 18; Ps. ii. 11.—In respect to נְעִימִים, *amœna*, pleasantness, comfort, see Ps. xvi. 6. Respecting עָבַר בַּשֶּׁלַח, "to perish by the dart" (or "in the dart"), see ch. xxxiii. 18.—On בִּבְלִי דָעַת, "in ignorance," or "through ignorance," see ch. xxxv. 16; also iv. 21.

Vers. 13-15 continue yet further in a peculiar way the thought of the last two verses, the precedence being given here to the lot of the wicked, which in the previous verses was spoken of in the second place; so that an inverted order of thought ensues—vers. 13, 14 corresponding to the contents of ver. 12, ver. 15 to that of ver. 11.—**And the impure in heart cherish wrath.**—יָשִׂימוּ אַף, *scil.* בְּלִבָּם (comp. ch. xxii. 22; Ps. xiii. 3 [2]; Prov. xxvi. 24), or possibly—"they set up wrath," in a warlike manner, against God as their enemy. The meaning, however, can scarcely be: "they lay up with God a store of wrath," as though אַף here signified not men's own discontent, but the divine wrath, and the θησαυρίζειν ὀργήν of Rom. ii. 5 were a parallel expression (Aben-Ezra, Rosenm. [E. V. app'y, Con., Words., Carey], *etc.* [Considered by itself, the expression שִׂים אַף would seem to be most simply rendered by "lay up wrath." But the second member of the verse, which speaks of the conduct of the wicked when God afflicts them, favors rather the explanation of the commentary.—Instead of showing submission to God, they treasure up rebellious wrath within. This rendering of שִׂים is justified by the reff. given above; and of אַף by ch. xviii. 4 (comp. also חֵמָה, ver. 18); and the analogy of כַּעַשׂ and קִנְאָה in ch. v. 4.—E.]—**They pray not** (lit. "cry not," שִׁוְּעוּ, according to ch. xxx. 20; xxxviii. 41) **when He hath chained them** (comp. ver. 8), **so that they must perish**, *etc.* תָּמֹת jussive, expressing the necessary consequence of the presumption of the dissolute. Respecting בַּנֹּעַר, "in youth, in the fresh vigor of youth," comp. ch. xxxiii. 25.—**And their life is among the polluted**, *i. e.* like that of the polluted (comp. ch. xxxiv. 36). The Vulg. correctly: *inter effeminatos.* For the word קְדֵשִׁים refers to the Syrian Canaanitish temple-prostitutes of the male sex, and the verse describes the effect of their incontinence in enervating, debilitating their manhood, and causing them to decay in the flower of their age (comp. Deut. xxiii. 18; 1 Kings xiv. 24; xv. 12; xxii. 47 [46]). The reference is not to the violation of women or maidens, in a military invasion (as described in Gen. xxxiv.; Judg. xix., *etc.*). The point of comparison lies not in the violence, but in the prematureness (and shamefulness) of the death.

Ver. 15 **But He delivereth the sufferer by his affliction**; *i. e.* He rescues at last out of his misery the man who quietly and willingly endures, just by virtue of his constant endurance; He makes his suffering serve as a means of deliverance and a ransom to him (comp. ver. 18 *b*). There seems to be a play upon words intended between יְחַלֵּץ and בַלַּחַץ in *b*, which may be approximately rendered [in German] by translating with Delitzsch: Doch den Duldenden *entrückt* Er durch sein Dulden, und öffnet durch *Bedrückung* ihr Ohr.

4. Proof of the divine righteousness, *β.* specially from Job's experiences: vers. 16–21.—**And even thee he lures out of the jaws of distress.**—So correctly most of the moderns

since Schultens. הֵסִית with מִן signifies, as in 2 Chron. xviii. 31, "to lure away from anything, out of anything" (not "to draw out," as the Pesh., Targ., Rabbis explain, nor "to rescue," as the Vulg. renders it). [Wordsworth: "He is instigating and impelling thee by means of thy affliction into a state of greater glory and happiness."] וְאַף הֲסִיתְךָ is used, inasmuch as אף must occupy its usual place at the beginning of the sentence, for וְהֵסִית אַף אֹתְךָ [אַף serving to connect emphatically the particular case of Job with the general proposition expressed in the preceding verse. Schlottm.], and expresses not a future, but a present sense [the *pret.* being used either because Elihu has in mind God's purpose in decreeing the present suffering of Job (Del.), or because that friendly process of alluring is conceived of as having begun in the past, and being continued in the present (Schl.). The expression מִפִּי־צָר figuratively describes the distress as a monster, with open jaws, threatening or attempting to swallow him.—E.] —**Into a wide place under which there is no narrowness**; *i. e.* into a wide place (רַחַב femin. accus. of the place aimed at), the foundation of which exhibits no narrowness, hence signifying "without narrowness in its foundation; or, which is better, a wide space, *in place of which* (תחת as in ch. xxxiv. 26) is no narrowness, a wide place broken by no straits." As to the figure comp. Ps. iv. 2 [1]; xviii. 20 [19], *etc.* [The same figure is implied in all three terms, צַר, רַחַב, and מוּצָק, the last from צוּק, to be strait.]—**And the setting of** [=that which is set on] **thy table** (He makes, or becomes) **fulness of fatness**; the same fig. to describe a state of flourishing prosperity as in Ps. xxiii. 5 (comp. Prov. ix. 2; Ps. xxii. 27 [26]; cvii. 9, *etc.*) נַחַת from נוּחַ, "to settle down," referring to that which is set down on a table, or served for it, the food set on it. *Fat* food is used as a sign of feasts which are particularly expensive and abundant in Is. xxv. 6; lv. 2; Gen. xxvii. 28, 39. Ewald, Vaih. and Dillm. take רַחַב in the second member, as also נַחַת in the third (the latter in the sense of "peace") as subj. of the whole proposition, and thus obtain the meaning: "Verily, the wide place without straits, the peace of thy table full of fat, has misled thee more than sharp distress" (Dillmann: "away from the mouth of distress" [*i. e.* away from obeying the teachings of adversity]). But this thought, involving as it does a serious charge against Job, is poorly connected with what goes before, and is rendered impossible by the clause מִפִּי־צָר, which in connection with הסית cannot well signify anything else than "out of the mouth (jaws) of adversity."

Ver. 17. **But if thou art filled with the judgment of the wicked, then** (truly) **will judgment and punishment take firm hold,** *viz.*, on thee, will not depart from thee (not—"will take hold upon each other, follow each other by turns [as Carey, *e. g.*, explains, "the act of judgment and the delivery of the sentence are very closely connected;" or according to others (*e. g.*, Barnes) such opinions (those of the wicked) would be rapidly followed by judgment] —which reciprocal meaning of תמך would have been expressed rather by the Niph. יִתָּמֵכוּ. The first member is in any case, as respects the thought, a hypothetical antecedent; in order to be a strict grammatical antecedent the Pret. מָלֵאתָ must of course have stood at the beginning. דִּין stands in *a* in the sense of guilt (Rosenmüller, Stickel, Hahn), or of a "murmuring judgment, presumptuous decision" respecting God (Umbreit, Hirzel, Schlottmann, Delitzsch, *etc.*); only in *b* does it denote the divine sentence of punishment. In no case does it express in both instances precisely the same meaning, as Ewald, Arnh., Dillmann, *etc.*, suppose. ["He, whom thou dost presume to judge with words, will judge thee in deed." Schlottm. The rendering of E. V., Good, Lee, Carey, Renan, *etc.*—"Thou hast fulfilled the judgment of the wicked," implying that Job had realized in his own experience the full measure of crime or of punishment belonging to the wicked, is certainly too harsh for the connection. The tone of the passage is strongly admonitory no doubt, but such a sentiment as that just referred to would carry Elihu too far into the camp of the opposition, represented by the friends.—E.].

Ver. 18 suitably introduces a warning to follow the threat just uttered. Here again Elihu has in mind the chief fault of Job,—his presumptuous complaining against God, and his doubt of God's justice.—**For the heat** (of thy afflictions) **should not mislead thee by its greatness**; *i. e.*, should not cause thee to err in respect to God's goodness and justice, or to judge God after the manner of the wicked (comp. ver. 17 *a*). [There seems to be a contrast intended between הסיתך in ver. 16, and יסיתך here. God would by His discipline lure, or urge him out of a narrow into a broad place: the חמה of this ver. would urge him against God.—E.] Hahn correctly thinks the heat (חֵמָה) spoken of to be the heat of his sufferings. The passage, as appears clearly enough from *b*, is a parallel to 1 Pet. iv. 12 (Jas. i. 2 seq.). It is less natural to understand חֵמָה of the heat of his passion (Delitzsch) or of his anger [against God] (Stickel, Welte, Schlottm. [Conant, Wordsworth], *etc.*), or of the Divine anger (Rosenm., Umbreit, Dillmann) [E. V., Good, Ber., Barnes, Noyes, Rodwell, *etc.*],—although these renderings cannot be called unsuitable. On the contrary the attempt of Ewald, Hirzel, Vaih., Heiligst., to identify חֵמָה with חֶמְאָה, "cream" (ch. xxix. 6), and that in the sense of riches ("may thy riches not betray thee"), is alike insipid and destructive of the sense. It may remain doubtful whether בְּשָׂפֶק (Pausal form for בְּשֶׂפֶק), signifies "into scorn, to mock and deride" (Stickel, Umbreit, Hahn, Schlottmann, Delitzsch, *etc.*) or "through superfluity, through abundance" (Ewald, Heil., Dillmann) [Fürst]. The latter rendering, which regards שֶׂפֶק as a dialectic alternate form of סֵפֶק (ch. xx. 22) seems to be favored both by the preposition בְּ (not לְ), and the parallel רָב־כֹּפֶר in the second member. [To the above

should be added the signification "stroke," which may fairly be vindicated for שׂפק from the use of the alternate form ספק just referred to in Commy. (comp. ch. xxvii. 23 with ch. xxxiv. 26, 37). Thus defined it may be taken here (with Kimchi, Schult., *etc.*), in the sense of the clapping of hands, with the idea of expulsion, or in the sense of "stroke, chastisement," (E. V., Merc., Rosenm., Gesenius, Carey, Ber., Good, Noyes, Barnes, Rod., Elzas, *etc.*). The latter would be the simpler. In that case חֵמָה may refer to the divine wrath, which is the view taken by most of those who thus explain שׂפק, בְּ being explained as instrumental (E. V. "with His stroke"). It is better however to explain it of the anger or passionate discontent of man against God (comp. אַף above in ver. 13) for the reason that elsewhere הֵסִית בְּ means uniformly to excite against. Thus Conant: "For beware, lest anger stir thee up against chastisement." The thought thus obtained would be moreover altogether suitable to the connection. Elihu's great anxiety is that Job should through submission profit by his chastisement, and that on the other hand he should not by a rebellious spirit resist, and so frustrate the object of the Divine discipline.—E.].—**And let the abundance of the ransom not ensnare thee**; *i.e.*, let not the fact that thou must reckon up so large a ransom for the expiation of thy guilt, that thou must make such a severe expiation of the same, lead thee into error touching the goodness of God. כֹּפֶר here accordingly in a somewhat different sense from ch. xxxiii. 24. The supposition that the reference is to Job's "vast wealth" in earthly possessions, with which he might erroneously imagine that he could purchase his release from God (Ewald, Hirz., Vaih. [Renan], *etc.*), is decidedly untenable, and would impute to Job a reliance on earthly treasures, the like of which the three friends even had not once ventured to charge upon him, much less the far more considerate and just Elihu. [Schl., with better reason, assumes that the reliance, or ransom intended here is Job's piety. "He might think in some measure that he did not need to be very exact in what he should say concerning God's dealings, because he could put all his piety, the beneficent use which he had made of all his treasures, in the other scale of the balance." The idea of Zöckler on the contrary seems to be that God requires a great ransom in the sense of expiation, before the sinner can be delivered. Let not the greatness of that ransom, says Elihu, lead thee into error, *i. e.*, the error of doubting the goodness of God. The rendering of E. V., "then a great ransom cannot deliver thee,' is not an unsuitable thought in the connection. The principal objection to it lies in the verb נטה, which cannot well be rendered "deliver." Gesenius, in order to obtain this meaning explains thus: "a great ransom cannot turn thee away, scil. from the Divine punishment, so as to avoid it." But this is not altogether natural, and such a form of expression occurs nowhere else. This rendering, still further, seems to hang on the view that אַף means the Divine anger, and that הֵסִית בְּ means "to take away with," against which see above. The negative אַל moreover does not favor it; for although it *might* have been used indeed in dependence on פֶּן, still such a construction would have been less natural and forcible than that with לֹא. It must be confessed that no interpretation of the verse which has been suggested is free from difficulties, and Dillmann's conjecture of a corruption of the text is not altogether without reason.—E.].

Ver. 19 seq. continue the warning against impatient and discontented conduct in *distress.*—**Shall thy crying put thee out of distress?**—שׁוּעַ, "crying," as in ch. xxx. 24 (comp. ch. xxxv. 9, and above ver. 13 *b*); יַעֲרֹךְ, a more choice word to express the idea of שִׂים or שִׁית, "to place," (comp. ch. xxxvii. 19): the object of הֲיַעֲרֹךְ is easily supplied by "thee," or "any one." The meaning of the question accordingly can be only: "will thy *crying*, thy lamentation, thy discontented raging, put thee in non-distress (לֹא בְּצָר, equivalent to בְּלֹא צָר), take thee out of distress?" So correctly Stickel, Hahn, Del. All other renderings depart more or less from the meaning required by the context: as *e. g.* that of Hirz.: "Will thy riches suffice? O, not gold (בְּצָר=בֶּצֶר, chap. xxii. 24 seq.), nor all treasures," *etc.* [Good: "Will then thy magnificence avail? Not gold, nor," *etc.*]; of Schlottmann: "Will thy treasures suffice? O not in distress," *etc.*; of Ewald: "Will thy riches equip thee—without distress—with all the means of power?" of Rosenmüller, Umbreit, Ebrard [E. V.: Gesenius, Fürst, under בצר, though differently under ערך, Renan, Noyes, Rodwell, Conant: "Will He value thy riches without stint, and all the might of wealth?"]: "Will He value thy riches?" *etc.*; of Dillmann: "Will He set in order thy cry (of supplication)?" **And all the efforts of strength** (*i. e.*, of thy strength)?—To שׁוּעֲךָ, which is made sufficiently determinate by the subject, the notion of "efforts of strength" is here suitably appended as an additional subject. מַאֲמַצֵּי from אָמֵץ, "to be strong, firm," in connection with כֹּחַ, can signify only a physical application of strength, not "wealth in treasures;" comp. אַמִּיץ כֹּחַ, chap. ix. 4, 19.

Ver. 20. **Pant not after the night, when (entire) peoples go up** (*i. e.*, fly up like chaff before the tempest, Isa. v. 24; Ps. i. 4) **in their place**—*i. e.*, do not long, as thou hast foolishly done (comp. ch. xiii. 18 sq.; xxiii. 3 sq.; xxiv. 1, 12), for the night of the divine judgment, with its terrors, sweeping away entire populations. In respect to שָׁאַף, *anhelare*, to long urgently for any thing, comp. ch. vii. 2; for the representation of the divine judgment by a night of terror, see ch. xxxiv. 20, 25; xxxv. 10. In respect to תַּחְתָּם, "in their place," here as regards the meaning="from their place," see above, v. 16. It is impossible, with De Wette, to take תַּחְתָּם as standing for תַּחַת עַמִּים, "to raise up people

in the place of people." The rendering of Stickel and Hahn is harsh, and much too artificial: "when people come uppermost, with that which is under them." The rendering of Delitzsch, however, is unnecessary, which takes לַעֲלוֹת as Inf. Hiph.=לְהַעֲלוֹת: "which will remove peoples from their place." [The rendering "in their place" does not do entire justice to the expression תַּחְתָּם, which is exactly rendered by our phrase, "on the spot." So again in ch. xl. 12; comp. Hab. iii. 16; 2 Sam. ii. 23 ("and he died on the spot"); vii. 10. The rendering of Conant and Carey: "when [Con.: "where"] people are carried off below" (to the world below), involves a very harsh incongruity between the verb ("go up") and the preposition ("below"). Conant argues that Elihu "is not speaking of any sudden calamity that sweeps whole races of men to the grave. This would be out of place here, for Job had desired no such thing. It was the repose of the grave for which he longed; for that night of death where successive generations sink down to the world beneath them." Such, it is true, was Job's conception of the night of death. But Elihu here reminds him that the night of death would be at the same time the night of divine judgment, and that so terrible is that judgment that it can sweep off whole peoples on the spot; how much less then could he, single-handed and alone, hope to face it without perishing. Let him rather repent, *etc.*, ver. 21.—E.]

Ver. 21 concludes these warnings against foolish murmuring and presumptuous complaining (which is here called אָוֶן, "vanity, wickedness," comp. v. 10) in an emphatic way, by expressing the thought found in Gen. viii. 21, and founded on the universal experience of the race, that the heart is naturally inclined to disobedience and to rebellion against God: **for to this thou hast desire more than to affliction.**—מִן, comparative, as in ch. vii. 15, not causal, as though מֵעֹנִי meant "on account of suffering, in view of affliction" (Vulg., Luther, Stickel, *etc.*), nor again instrumental (Ewald: "therefore thou wast proved *by suffering*." בָּחַר עַל here (otherwise than in 2 Sam. xix. 39 [38]) essentially the same with בָּחַר בְּ, to extend one's choice to any thing, *i. e.*, to be inclined towards any thing, to have a desire for it.

5. *Second Division.* Proof of the divine righteousness from the wonders of nature, from the power and wisdom revealed in the *physical* world.

a. Descriptive part: chs. xxxvi. 22—xxxvii. 13. *Introduction* or *transition:* vers. 22–25 (the first of three eight-lined strophes, vers. 22 sq., 26 sq., 30 sq., each of which begins with הֵן, and which by the exact equality and similarity of their structure give evidence of being one coherent whole—a structure which has been correctly recognized by Stickel and Delitzsch [also by Schlottmann, Noyes, Wordsworth, Carey, Rodwell], but ignored by Köst., Ewald, Dillmann, *etc.*). **Behold, God worketh loftily in His strength** [E. V.: Behold, God exalteth by His power; but less suitably to the connection, this strophe being, as has just been shown, introductory to the description of God's power in the *physical* world, rather than in the world of humanity.—E.].—As the meditation on truths lying in the realm of historical or ethical theology, which constitutes the preceding section, began with a הֵן, "behold" (ver. 5), vividly pointing out the theme of discourse, so also the meditation which is here introduced on truths in the realm of physical theology. The conjecture is in itself sufficiently probable, that some phenomenon of external nature, perhaps a thunder-storm, which already in ver. 5 was approaching, but which had now burst forth, with lightning, thunder, and heavy rain, furnished the occasion to this sudden and vivid transition to the description of the natural world. This conjecture receives a strong support from the emphatic double recurrence of the הֵן, first in ver. 26, at the beginning of the description of the rain, and then in ver. 30, in the transition to the description of lightning and thunder. The probability is still further increased by passages like chap. xxxvi. 33, and especially by chap. xxxvii. 2 sq. And finally it receives the strongest support from the article before סְעָרָה in ch. xxxviii. 1, which can scarcely be explained without the supposition here referred to (comp. on the passage). **Who is a ruler like to him?**—The usage of the language would justify, and indeed would even favor rather the rendering adopted by the Targ., Peshito, Luther, Schlottmann, Delitzsch [E. V., Lee, Noyes, Conant, Bernard, Renan, Rodwell, Barnes], *etc.:* "Who is a *teacher* like Him?" But the context, and especially the הִשְׂגִּיב in *a*, seems rather to favor the rendering supported by the LXX., which takes מוֹרֶה= Chald. מָרֵא (Dan. ii. 47), hence to mean "lord, ruler." The Vulg. attempts to give an explanation intermediate between the δυνάστης of the LXX. and the "teacher" of the other ancient versions by its use of *legislator: quis ei similis in legislatoribus?* [So Wordsworth combines "Master and Teacher;" Carey: "Master," as expressing the ambiguity of the original. Some (*e. g.*, Good): "And who, like Him, can cast down?" which would be a suitable antithesis to the E. V.'s rendering of *a:* "God exalteth by His power," but is open to the same objection; see above. In favor of the sense "teacher," Delitzsch argues: "(1) מוֹרֶה from הוֹרָה, Ps. xxv. 8, 12; xxxii. 8) has no etymological connection with מר; (2) it is, moreover, peculiar to Elihu to represent God as a teacher both by dreams and dispensations of affliction, ch. xxxiii 14 sq.; xxxiv. 32; and by His creatures, xxxv. 11; and (3) the designation of God as an incomparable teacher is also not inappropriate here, after His rule is described in ver. 22 *a* as transcendently exalted, which on that very account commands to human research a reverence which esteems itself lightly." These considerations at least show that the educational disciplinary functions of the Divine Ruler are prominently intended here; and this is in harmony with the general tone of this strophe.—E.]

Ver. 23. **Who hath appointed to Him His way?**—פקד על, "to charge one with any thing, to prescribe anything to any one," as in ch. xxxiv. 13. It would be possible also to render it: "Who hath inspected for Him His way?" (LXX., Vulg., Seb. Schmidt, Ewald, [Good], *etc.*). The second member permits both renderings.

Ver. 24. **Remember that thou exalt** (הַשְׂגִּיא, in a different sense from ch. xii. 23) **His doing, which men have greatly sung.** שֹׁרֵר an intensive form of שׁוּר, denoting singing often repeated, or various in its character. The exhortation to the praise and glorification of the exalted activity of God stands in significant antithesis to the previous warnings against sitting in judgment on the same. [Here again, as in ch. xxxiii. 27 E. V. takes the verb שׁוּר in the sense of "behold," which would be a useless and feeble tautology before the חזה and הביט of ver. 25.—E.].

Ver. 25. **All people gaze thereon with delight** (בוֹ referring back to פָּעֳלוֹ, ver. 24 *a*; חזה ב as elsewhere רכה ב); **mortals behold it from afar**;—*i. e.*, not—"they *can* behold it only from a great distance" (so Dillmann, who would compare ch. xxvi. 14), but—they *dare* not contemplate it anear, from reverential fear before the unapproachableness of His operations.

6. *Continuation.* Description of the storm, together with the mighty phenomena accompanying it, such as rain, clouds, lightning, thunder, *etc.*: ver. 26—chap. xxxvii. 5 (three strophes, the first two consisting of 4 verses each, the third of 5).

Vers. 26-29. **Behold, God is exalted** (שַׂגִּיא as in ch. xxxvii. 23, elsewhere only in the Aramaic portions of the O. T.), **we know not** (*i. e.*, how very exalted He is); **the number of His years is unsearchable** (lit. "as for the number of his years—so [וְ] there is no searching;" respecting the וְ introducing the apodosis, comp. ch. iv. 6; xv. 17). The eternity of God is here introduced as the explanatory ground (not as a mere co-ordinate "moment," as Dillmann supposes) of the divine greatness and wisdom. As the Eternal One, God has the power to effect all the glorious wonders in the realm of His creation which are enumerated in the passage following; comp. ch. xii. 12 seq. ["The Omnipotence and wisdom of God, which are everywhere apparent in the universe, furnish a testimony to God's righteousness. All attributes of the Divine Nature are rays proceeding from one centre; where one is, there also of necessity must the others be. How can the Being who everywhere shows Himself in creation to be most perfect, be defective in this one point? Every witness therefore in *Nature* to God's greatness as a *Creator*, rises against an arraignment of God's *righteousness*. Whoso will bring a charge against God's justice, must measure himself with the Divine Omnipotence.—At first sight it may seem surprising that the mind of the righteous sufferer is directed by Elihu and by Jehovah himself, to the wondrous formation of the clouds, to Thunder, Lightning and Snow, and to the War-horse, the Hawk, and the Eagle. But when we examine the matter more carefully, we see that such a course of reasoning is excellently fitted to its purpose. An Almighty and All-wise God, who is not at the same time righteous, is in truth an inconceivable impossibility. For this reason, they who impeach God's righteousness, are always on the high road to doubt His existence. Pelagianism leads not merely to the destruction of the true idea of God, but to blank Atheism (*Hengstenberg*). It must also be borne in mind that God rises from an appeal to the signs of His power and goodness in the visible world, and refers Job to His working in the *invisible* world, in the domain of spirits, and challenges Job to a comparison of human power with that of God in the defense and deliverance of mankind, even of Job himself, from his spiritual enemies. See below, ch. xl. 6-15." Wordsworth.].

Ver. 27. **For He draweth up the water drops**, to wit from the earth. This is the only rendering of יְגָרַע, which corresponds to the second member; not that of the LXX., Pesh., *etc.*; "He numbers off;" and just as little that of Stickel and Delitzsch: "He draws off [=lets fall] the drops," *i. e.*, out of the upper mass of waters [to which add the rendering of E. V., Mercier, *etc.* "He maketh small the drops of water." The reference seems clear to the first step in the process of forming the rain, by which the drops are *attracted* (upward of necessity, although that does not lie essentially in the verb, for which reason the objection of Delitzsch that it means *attrahere* or *detrahere*, but not *attrahere in sublime* falls to the ground), attracted, that is, towards Him who is the Divine cause.—E.]. **So that they ooze** (זקק, lit. "to filter, refine," comp. ch. xxviii. 1) **the rain with His mist**, *i. e.*, the mist which He spreads out [*i. e.*, since a mist produced by it (Gen. ii. 6) fills the expanse (רָקִיעַ), the downfall of which is just this rain." Delitzsch]. In respect to אֵד, comp. Gen. ii. 6; in respect to לְ, "with," (or also "on account of, by means of") comp. ch. xxxvii. 1 *a*. [E. V. "they pour down rain according to the vapor thereof." "Pour down" for זקק is neither sufficiently accurate nor expressive, destroying as it does the image of "filtering" which lies in the verb. "According to" may be accepted for לְ, which is obscure. According to Gesenius, it indicates the vapor as the *origin* of the rain—*quæ orta est ex vapore ejus:* and so Conant. According to others it denotes the *state* into which rain-drops pass in falling. According to Ewald it is a sign of the accusative, אֵד being in opposition with מָטָר. Is it not natural to find in vers. 27-28 a description of the successive steps in the formation of the rain—first (27 *a*) the ascent of the water-drops in evaporation—then (27 *b*) the filtering of the mist whereby rain is produced, then (ver. 28) the fall of the rain (*a*) in general, (*b*) in copious abundance? If this view be correct, the best explanation of לְ would seem to be that it denotes possession, or origin. The suffix in אֵדוֹ moreover is better referred to God than to the rain, especially according to the explanation here suggested.—E.]

Ver. 28. **Which the high clouds drop down.**—שְׁחָקִים here somewhat differently from ch. xxxv. 5) denoting such clouds indeed as are high, but not dry, or rainless; comp. Prov. iii. 20. Respecting the construction (אֲשֶׁר, accus. of material to יִזְּלוּ) comp. Ewald, § 281, *b*. In respect to *b* [**And distil upon the multitude of men**], comp. ch. xxxvii. 12 seq.—[רָב may (with E. V.) be taken adverbially="abundantly;" although it seems better with most moderns to take it as an adjective describing אָדָם "many men." In this case as well as the other the predominant thought seems to be the copiousness of the rain.—E.].

Ver. 29. **Yea** (אַף intensive, as elsewhere אַף כִּי, comp. ch. xxxv. 14) **can one understand the spreadings of the clouds?** their expansion, outspreading over the vault of heaven (comp. Ezek. xxvii. 7; Ps. cv. 39; not "their burstings," which מִפְרְשֵׂי could signify only if we were at liberty to derive it (with Hirzel and Stickel [Conant, Renan] from a verb פרשׂ=פָּרַס, *frangere*.—**The loud crashing of His pavilion?**—The thick, deep black thunder-clouds are here conceived of as the "tabernacle" behind which God veils Himself, precisely as in Ps. xviii. 12. It should be noted that the "tents" (סֻכּוֹת) of the orientals have the appearance of being predominantly black (comp. on Cant. i. 5; iv. 1). תְּשֻׁאוֹת; used of the loud crashing of the thunder (referred to the thunder-clouds, pictured as a tabernacle), hence somewhat differently from below, ch. xxxix. 7. [The magnificent terseness and power of the line תְּשֻׁאוֹת סֻכָּתוֹ should be noted.—E.].

Ver. 30 seq. Special description of the phenomena of thunder and lightning in the storm, as already announced in ver. 29 *b*.—**Behold, He spreadeth His light around Himself**; *i. e.* that eternal, heavenly veil of light, in which God dwells continually (Ps. civ. 2, *etc.*), and out of which the lightning flashes issue, like rays, gleaming through the clouds, and dividing them; comp. ver. 32; chap. xxxvii. 3. [עָלָיו, as here explained—around or over Himself—the suffix referring to God, not the "tabernacle,"—"upon it" E. V.]—**And with the roots of the sea He covereth Himself** (כִּסָּה with accus.—"to take anything as a covering," as in Jonah iii. 6). The "roots of the sea" are the masses of water drawn upwards out of the sea, into the heavens in the form of black clouds, and here serving God as a veil (so correctly Umbreit, Ewald, Vaihinger, Dillmann) [Conant, Noyes, who renders: "And He clotheth Himself with the depths of the sea"]. The expression is poetically bold, but still unmistakable (comp. שֹׁרֶשׁ in ch. xiii. 27; xxviii. 9. By הַיָּם we are to understand neither the waters of the heavens above (Hirzel, Schlottm.), nor the sea of clouds (Hahn) [Renan]. The expression denotes, as always, the ocean, regarded as the source of the atmospheric moistures which mount up from it. The language does not refer to a "covering of the foundations of the sea with the light of the lightning" (Stuhlm., Delitzsch) [Good, Wordsworth]; in order to express this thought, another אוֹר or כְּאוֹר would scarcely have been omitted with כִּסָּה. [Delitzsch explains his view as follows: "The lightning in a thunder-storm, especially when occurring at night, descends into the depths of the sea, like snares that are cast down (פַּחִים, Ps. xi. 6), and the water is momentarily changed, as it were, into a sea of flame." But this explanation does not adequately account for the use of שֹׁרֶשׁ. According to another explanation, God is represented as covering the depths of the sea, either with waters (Barnes), or with darkness, contrasting with the lightning which covers the sky (Lee, Rodwell). But neither of these explanations falls in naturally with the description of the storm. Renan: "Now He covers Himself with His lightnings as with a curtain; now He seems to hide Himself in the depths of the sea;" his explanation being: "He treats here of the alternations of light and darkness which take place in storms. The clouds are compared to a dark and deep sea." There is nothing, however, to indicate such a contrast between light and darkness. The "light" here is more especially that of the storm-lightning, in which God wraps Himself as a robe; the "ocean-roots" are the storm-clouds, conceived of as the waters lying in the depths of the sea, which God has lifted up, and gathered around Himself.—E.]

Ver. 31. **For therewith**—with lightnings and clouds (ver. 30)—**He judgeth the people, giveth food in abundance.**—לְמַכְבִּיר only here,=the expression לָרֹב, usually found elsewhere. The whole verse—which has somewhat of a parenthetic character, as an ethical and theological reflection in the midst of a passage which otherwise is purely descriptive—which, however, is not (with Olshausen) to be placed between vers. 28 and 29—reminds us of Schiller:

> Aus der Wolke quillt der Segen,
> Strömt der Regen;
> Aus der Wolke, ohne Wahl,
> Zuckt der Strahl.*

Ver. 32. **Both hands He covereth over with light and sendeth it forth against the adversary.**—This is a more specific description of what God does in judging the people (ver. 31 *a*), and the use He makes therein of the lightning. ["God is represented under a military figure as a slinger of lightnings: He covers light over both hands, *i. e.* arms both completely with light, and directs it." Delitzsch.] Who the adversary is (מַפְגִּיעַ, LXX., Theod.: ἀπαντῶν) against whom He sends forth the light (lit. "commands it, enacts concerning it," צִוָּה with עַל, as often) remains undetermined, and needs not to be inquired into. It signifies at any rate any hostile powers, against which God sends forth His lightnings; comp. Ps. xviii. 14 seq.;

---

* From the cloud the blessing springeth,
Rain it bringeth;
From the cloud unasked, the beam
Doth quivering gleam.

xi. 6; Wisd. xix. 12, *etc*. The signification of מַפְגִּיעַ elsewhere (=*intercessor*, Is. lix. 16) does not suit here. The change of the word into מִפְגָּע, "point of attack" (ch. vii. 20), proposed by Olshausen, is however untenable. The same may be said of Hahn's explanation of the word in this sense. Delitzsch renders it peculiarly: "and commissioneth it as one who hitteth the mark" (בְּ as בְּ *essentiæ*, and הפגיע after Isai. liii. 6). [Delitzsch connects it with God, as "a sure aimer."—Wordsworth a little differently with the lightning: "He giveth it a command as an assailant, or an avenger."—Lee: "He layeth His commands upon it to destroy."—Rosenmüller, Stickel, Elzas: "He commandeth it where to strike." Barnes, Carey: "He commandeth it in striking." The rendering of E. V.: "With clouds (כַּפַּיִם for clouds from their fancied resemblance to *hands*) He covereth the light, and commandeth it not to shine by the cloud that cometh betwixt," pre-supposes too much. The rendering of the Commentary: "against the enemy," is that which is best supported by the etymology, grammatical form, and connection.—E.]

Ver. 33. **His thunder-cry announces Him**; lit. "His alarm-cry makes announcement (1 Sam. xxvii. 11) concerning Him." רֵעוֹ in accordance with Ex. xxxii. 17; Mic. iv. 9; not=רֵעֵהוּ [His friend, companion], as indeed almost all the ancient versions take it [LXX.: "The Lord will declare concerning this to His friend"]; also among the moderns Umbreit and Schlottmann. ["He makes known to it (scil. the light, or lightning) His friend." So Barnes.] Just as little does it mean: "His thought, decree" (Cocceius, Böttcher, Welte) [Elzas: "By it He announceth His will."—E. V., Rosenm., *etc.*: "The noise thereof showeth concerning it," taking the suffix to refer to the storm, not to God; which is altogether too insipid].—**The cattle even** (announce) **that He is on the march**; or: "concerning Him who is coming upward." This is beyond a doubt the most satisfactory explanation of the difficult closing member מִקְנֶה אַף עַל־עוֹלֶה;—an explanation which becomes still more obvious if—instead of assuming, as is commonly done (so Rosenm., Stick., Ew., Vaih., Heil., Delitzsch, *etc.*), merely a general reference to the uneasy movements of animals at the first approach of a thunder-storm, and comparing with it passages like Virgil, *Georg*. I., 373 seq.; Pliny, *H. N.* XVIII., 35, *etc.*,—we suppose that the storm thus far described had occasioned under the eyes of the assembly, before which Elihu speaks, a certain bewilderment or destruction in a particular herd of cattle;—if, accordingly, we assume *an actual occasion to have been given for this description*—an occasion which is not to be more particularly defined, and so derive again out of the passage before us a confirmation of the supposition advanced above on ver. 22. In that case we need have recourse to none of the artificial and violent make-shifts, into the adoption of which expositors have fallen here, as *e. g.* the rendering of מִקְנֶה in the absolutely unheard of signification of "jealousy, fury of wrath" (Hahn: "a raging of wrath announces Him who is uprising;" and comp. Schlottmann); the changing of the word into מְקַנֵּא (Hitzig), or מְקַנֵּא (Böttcher, Dillmann, who at the same time read עַוְלָה instead of עוֹלֶה: "causing His anger to rage against iniquity"), *etc.* [Schlottmann's rendering, referred to above—"and the fury of wrath against iniquity (or against transgressors)" is the one adopted by Fürst, Good, Lee, Bernard, Carey, Elzas.—The possible varieties of interpretation of the verse are endless. See the more important set forth in Schultens, Schlottmann, and Conant. The simplicity, life-likeness, and appositeness of the rendering adopted in the Commy. (and by Ewald, Delitz., Gesenius, Renan, Wordsworth, Rodwell, and Conant—who however takes מִקְנֶה as *object*, rather than subject—"to the herds") will commend it to most.—E.].

Ch. xxxvii. 1–5. Further description of the terror-working power of the thunder and lightning.

Ver. 1. **Yea, because of this** (לְזֹאת, comp. ch. xxxvi. 27), **my heart trembleth, and quaketh out of its place**; lit., "springs, or starts up," comp. ch. vi. 9. Why this should be regarded as "an exaggerated, hardly an elegant expression" (Dillmann), is not apparent.

Ver. 2. **Hear, O hear, the roar of His voice**.—שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמוֹעַ, a summons to hear closely and attentively, comp. ch. xiii. 17; xxi. 2. The phenomena of the thunder and lightning seem, at this particular moment of the description, so very near to the speaker and his hearers, that some commentators, as Böttcher, Schlottmann, Delitzsch, have found here at least an indication of the probability that the poet presupposes a storm as advancing during the colloquy. It is, however, evidently not an approaching thunder-storm to which the description refers, but one which had been for some time already present, and which might be heard now loudly roaring (see *a*), and now lowly murmuring or rumbling (see *b*) [**and the rumbling** (הֶגֶה, E. V.: too general—"sound") **that goeth forth out of His mouth**]. Comp. what Delitzsch himself strikingly says: "The five-fold repetition of קוֹל—a word of sombre sound, for which our *Stimme* [Voice] is a miserable substitute—calls to mind the seven קוֹלוֹת in Ps. xxix." Against Dillmann's assertion, that if the poet had purposed to represent the thunder-storm mentioned in ch. xxxviii. 1 as here already advancing, he would not have begun his series of physico-theological reflections with the storm, but would have reserved it for the conclusion, it may be argued that at the close of his discourse, and after his digression in respect to the cold, rain season, *etc.* (vers. 6-13), Elihu does in fact again repeatedly take up the phenomena of storms and atmospheric changes; comp. on ch. xxxviii. 1.

Ver. 3. **Under the whole heaven He leadeth it forth**—or: "He sends it forth, looses it" (יִשְׁרֵהוּ, Imperf. Kal. of the Aram. שׁרה), *i. e.*, the roaring and the rumbling. [The definition

of the verb here adopted is preferred by Ewald, Fürst, Del., Dillm., Hirz., Lee, Carey, Wordsw., *etc.*, on the ground that it is more appropriate as applied to the thunder (let loose through the immeasurable vault of heaven), and particularly to the zig-zag course of the lightning, than the signification "to direct" (from יָשַׁר, which rests on the fundamental idea of straightness).—E.]. **And His lightning** (lit. "His light") **unto the borders of the earth.**—In respect to כַּנְפוֹת הָאָרֶץ, see on chap. xxxviii. 13. As to the thought, comp. Luke xvii. 24 and parallel passages.

Ver. 4. **After it roareth the sound of the thunder: He thundereth with the voice of His majesty**—lit. "He will thunder" (יַרְעֵם), voluntative, as also יִשָּׁמַע in *c*).—**And restraineth them not** (*i. e.*, the lightnings, the particular rays of the אוֹר mentioned in ver. 3), **when His voice resounds** [lit. **is heard**].—עִקֵּב, not "to track out, to follow up" (Symmachus, Vulg., Ewald [who renders interrogatively: "and will He not find them out when His voice is heard?" *i. e.*, track them in their hiding-places with His thunder and lightning], but in accordance with the Targ., עַכֵּב, to hold back, *refrenare, cohibere* [the idea being that the roar of the thunder and the flash of the lightning follow in quick succession].

Ver. 5. **God thundereth marvellously with His voice.**—נִפְלָאוֹת here used adverbially=*mirabiliter*, as in Dan. viii. 24; Ps. lxv. 6; cxxxix. 14. In respect to *b*, comp. ch. v. 9; ix. 10; xxxvi. 26. The verse ends for the time the description, so far as it relates to the storm, and by a general observation respecting God's greatness leads the way to the following examples of the same.

7. Continuation. The phenomena of winter, such as snow, rain, the north wind, frost, *etc.*: ch. xxxvii. 6-13.

Ver. 6. **For to the snow He saith—Fall to the earth.**—הֱוֵא erroneously rendered "Be" by the LXX., Targ., Pesh. [E. V.] (on the contrary, correctly by Jerome—*ut descendat*), is Imperat. of הוה, "to fall" (lit. "to gape, to yawn"), a root obtaining elsewhere only in Arabic as a verb; hence another of the Arabisms of this Elihu section, as in ch. xxxiv. 36; xxxv. 15, *etc.* In the two following members the ל of לַשֶּׁלֶג extends its influence: (also) **to the rain-shower** (גֶּשֶׁם, a heavy, pouring rain; a stronger term than מָטָר), **and the rain-showers of His strength**—*i. e.*, His mighty, pouring rain-showers (the plural structure similar to קוֹל בֹּכִים in ch. xxx. 31; comp. Ewald, § 270, *c*). The rain, being by far the most common form in which the moisture of the atmosphere is precipitated during the Syro-Arabian winter, where it comes down particularly in the late autumn (as the early rain), and in the early spring (as the latter rain), is by the double designation more strongly emphasized than the snow. Comp. still further, as a parallel in thought, Isa. lv. 10.

Vers. 7-8 describe the effects of the cold of winter on men and beasts. ["The wonders of nature during the rough season (סְתָיו, חֹרֶף, Cant. ii. 11), between the autumnal and vernal equinoxes, are meant; the rains after the autumnal equinox (the early rain), which begin the season, and the rains before the vernal equinox (the late rain, Zech. x. 11), which close it, with the falls of snow between, which frequently produce great desolation, especially the proper winter, with its frosty winds and heavy showers, when the business of the husbandman, as of the nomads, is brought to a stand-still, and every one retreats to his house or seeks a sheltering corner." Del.]

Ver. 7. **The hand of every man He puts under a seal**—so that it is disabled from carrying on field-work (comp. HOMER, *Iliad*, XVII. 549 seq.: *ὅς ῥά τε ἔργων ἀνθρώπους ἀνέπαυσεν ἐπὶ χθονί*). Respecting חתם ב, comp. ch. xxxiii. 16. The object of this sealing influence of the winter frost on the hands of men is: **that all men of His work may come to knowledge**—*i. e.*, that all men created by God may learn how mighty He is, and how entirely dependent on Him they are. "Men of His work" is a somewhat singular collocation of words, which does not occur elsewhere, which, however, has its parallel in the expression, "sheep of His hand," Ps. xcv. 7, and for that reason is not of necessity to be set aside in the way of conjecture. At the same time, the rendering of the Vulg.: *ut noverint singuli opera sua*, furnishes a witness not altogether to be slighted in behalf of the emendation of Olshausen, favored also by Delitzsch—לָדַעַת כָּל־אֲנָשִׁים מַעֲשֵׂהוּ.

In regard to ver. 8 [**Then creeps the beast into his covert, and in his lairs doth he remain**] comp. Psalm civ. 22, where, it is true, that which is spoken of is not exactly the influence of winter in causing beasts to seek out places of shelter.

Ver. 9. **Out of the secret chamber cometh the storm.**—חֶדֶר, "chamber" (*penetrale claustrum*) denotes the enclosure out of which the storm-wind rushes forth, as in chap. xxxviii. 22 (comp. Psalm cxxxv. 7) mention is made of the "storehouses" of the snow. Comp. ch. ix. 9—"chambers of the south," with which expression the one before us is not to be identified without further qualification. For instead of storms from the south or south-east (Rosenmüller, Umbreit, Vaihinger, Welte, Delitzsch) [E. V.], the language here refers rather to storms from the north or north-east, as certainly as that below in ver. 17 the sultry and heating quality of the south wind is intended. **And cold from the cloud-scatterers.**—מְזָרִים, probably Partic. Piel. plur. from זָרָה, "to sweep away, to scatter," hence *dispergentes* (scil. *venti*), the cloud-sweepers, a designation of violent cold storms (as in Arab. *dariyat*, they which blow away; Kor. *Sur.* 51, 1), which indeed are also to be regarded as coming from the north or east; comp. ch. i. 19. The ancient versions seem not to have understood the word which occurs only here. Thus the LXX.: *ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκρωτηρίων* (a corruption perchance of *ἀρκτῴων*?); Vulg.: *ab arcturo;* Aq.,

Theod.: ἀπὸ Μαζούρ (similarly the Targ.) [Fürst and Lee: the Northern constellations; Mercier: *Septentriones;* Good: the Arctic chambers; Renan: the north winds, *etc.*].

Ver. 10. **From the breath of God there is** יִתֶּן (impersonal as also Prov. xiii. 10) ["there cometh, there is given"] **ice**—*viz.*, when a cold blast, proceeding from God, sweeps over the face of the water, by means of which, according to *b*, "the breadth of the waters (is brought) into a strait" (comp. ch. xxxvi. 16), *i. e.*, is solidified, and so fettered as it were, is arrested in its free, flowing movement. Precisely thus the Arabic poet, Montenebbi: "the flood is chained by bands of ice." In respect to the apparent contradiction between this representation and the physical fact of the expansion of freezing water, see below on chap. xxxviii. 30.

Vers. 11–13 return to the description of the phenomena of clouds and rain, occasioned by a new phase of the storm just taking place, consisting in the outpouring of rain in extraordinary abundance. Schlottmann correctly: "The storm in its magnificent approach drifts victoriously before all the senses of Elihu, so that from all other images brought forward as they are with a certain haste, he ever recurs to that of the storm" (comp. Del).

Ver. 11. **Also he loadeth with moisture the clouds**—comp. ch. xxvi. 8.—רִי, from רוה, signifies "moisture, wet," and הִטְרִיחַ, related to טֹרַח, "burden," is "to load, to make heavy." All explanations which take בְּרִי as *one* word from the root ברר (or ברה) are against the connection, *e. g.*, "serenity [brightness] dispels the clouds" (Targ., Rosenm., Umbreit [Bernard, Barnes, Elzas], *etc.*); *frumentum* (בַּר) desiderat nubes (Vulg., Symmach.); ἐκλεκτὸν καταπλήσσει νεφέλη (LXX., and similarly Theod., Pesh.). [Gesenius, Noyes: "In rain He casts down the thick cloud." Carey: "By (its) watering the thick cloud falleth headlong." But the vers. which follow, and particularly ver. 12 *a*, are scarcely consistent with the idea that the cloud has cast down its contents. E. V. also seems to take רִי actively—"by watering He wearieth the thick cloud;" the meaning being apparently that by showering down its contents the cloud is wearied or worn away; against which the objection just noted holds.—E.]. **He spreadeth far and wide the clouds of His light**—*i. e.*, the thunder-clouds, pregnant with lightning, through which the lightning flashes; comp. ch. xxxvi. 29; and in respect to הֵפִיץ, "to scatter, to spread abroad," comp. chap. xxxviii. 24.

Ver. 12. **And these—round about they turn themselves.**—וְהוּא cannot refer to God (Rosenmüller, Schlottmann) [Lee; also Good and Elzas, who, however, both render מְסִבּוֹת "seasons" (courses)]. It can be referred only to עָנָן, or עָב, "clouds," ver. 11. [The most natural way of accounting for its use here is to understand it as descriptive, Elihu pointing out the cloud at the time—וְהוּא—"And there it is! turning round about, hither and thither," *etc.* Thus understood, it would be better to adhere to the singular rendering of "cloud" in ver. 11, as being more individual and vivid.—E.]. מְסִבּוֹת, "round about," as elsewhere סָבִיב, or סְבִיבוֹת.—**Piloted by Him** (lit. "by His pilotings," the clouds being thought of as God's ships, or coursers; comp. Ps. xviii. 11 [10] seq.) **according to their doings**—*i. e.*, according to the actions of men, God having established a strict economic relation between those actions and the agency of His clouds in heaven, now yielding a blessing and now working destruction. This reference of the suffix in לְפָעֳלָם to men (Ewald, Hirzel, Heil., Dillm.) is favored by ver. 13, as also by the Masoretic accentuation, which forbids the connection of לפעלם with what follows, according to the view which finds favor with the majority of modern commentators—"that they may do whatever he commandeth them on the face," *etc.* [To which add the use of the strongly individualizing and descriptive הוא at the beginning of the verse, after which it is altogether unlikely that the plural suffix would be used, especially seeing that again in ver. 13 *b* the sing. suffix is used, יַמְצִאֵהוּ.—E.] The third member expresses the object of the verb פעל—**Whatsoever He commands to them upon the globe.** The pleonastic expression תֵּבֵל אַרְצָה [lit. "the habitable land (of) the earth"] occurs again in Prov. viii. Respecting the form אַרְצָה, comp. already ch. xxxiv. 13.

Ver. 13. More specific statement of the object for which God steers the clouds in accordance with the conduct of men: **be it for a scourge, when it is** (necessary) **for His earth, or for a blessing, He causeth it to come.**—אִם־לְאַרְצוֹ. is not co-ordinate with the two other conditional clauses (Rosenm., Umbreit, Del. [E. V., Noyes, Words., Carey, Rod.]; "now for a scourge, now for the benefit of His earth, now for mercy," *etc.*), but subordinate [as is proved (1) by the decided contrast between "whether for a scourge" and "or for mercy," each at the beginning of its half-verse; a contrast and a proportion of parts which would be destroyed by introducing another co-ordinate אִם; (2) by the tautology which ensues from making the second clause with אם co-ordinate, there being really no material difference between "for the benefit of His land" (or earth), and "for mercy."—E.] The earth is called "*His* earth," because it is God's possession (comp. ch. xxxiv. 13), and the לְ before אַרְצוֹ differs from the לְ before the other two nouns, in that it introduces a *Dat. commodi.* In respect to שֵׁבֶט="chastisement," comp. ch. xxi. 9.

8. *Conclusion.* *b. Application:* chap. xxvii. 14-24. Instead of censuring God, or quarreling with Him, Job should draw from His wonderful operations in the natural world the right conclusion in regard to the mystery of his suffering.

The appeals and questions addressed to Job to the end of the discourse, are seriously intended. An unprejudiced consideration of the passage will find in it no trace of "a lofty irony" (Schlottmann, Ewald, Dillmann).

Ver. 14. **Hearken unto this, O Job, stand still,** *etc.* Both "this" (זֹּאת), and the "wonders of God" in *b*, point not to what follows, but to the contents of the preceding descriptions.

Ver. 15. **Dost thou know how God commandeth them?**—שׂוּם עַל, as in Ex. v. 8, and often, of imposing commands upon, not, as in ch. xxxiv. 23, of "setting one's thoughts on anything" (Rosenmüller, Hirzel, Delitzsch [Conant, Rodwell, Gesenius; *i. e.*, when God planned (E. V., "disposed") them]). בְּשׂוּם is not (according to the authorities just mentioned) a determination of time when, but a specification of the object of הֲתֵדַע, this specification being further enlarged by the Perf. consec. וְהוֹפִיעַ. [According to this explanation בְּ is used partitively after ידע, like the Greek genit. after verbs of knowing, "to have knowledge of," hence of partial knowledge. See Ewald, § 217, 3, 2, γ]. The suffix in עֲלֵיהֶם refers back either to the "wonders of God," ver. 14 *b*, or to the "clouds," ver. 11 sq. "Causing the light of the clouds to shine," in *b* (comp. ch. iii. 4; x. 3, *etc.*) is a circumlocution for the simple idea of lightning; comp. ver. 11 *b*.

Ver. 16. **Dost thou understand the balancings of the clouds?**—מִפְלְשֵׂי from פָּלַשׂ =פלס, to weigh (Ps. lviii. 3 [2]), to poise, a similar structure to that of מִפְרְשֵׂי, ch. xxxvi 29, but not for that reason to be regarded as an interchangeable form of that word (against Ewald). Respecting תְּמִים דֵּעִים in *b*, comp. on ch. xxxvi. 4. The form מִפְלְאוֹת instead of נִפְ׳ found only here.

Vers. 17, 18 introduce a new, and at the same time the last digression from the phenomena of storms, which otherwise constitute throughout the principal theme of the description. Here it is to the phenomena which accompany the full blaze of the summer sun beaming in a perfectly serene and clear sky, that the speaker digresses. The אֲשֶׁר of ver. 17 is not a conjunction = כִּי (Rosenm., Umbreit, Hirzel) [Good, Lee, Noyes, Renan, Rodwell, Barnes, *etc.*, and E. V.] or = אִם (Schlottmann), but a pronoun referring to Job, the person addressed, and introducing a relative clause, precedent to the interrogative sentence in ver. 18.—**Thou, whose clothes** (become) **hot, when the earth becomes sultry** (lit. "becomes calm, still") **from the South**; *i. e.*, not merely by the south-wind, which דָּרוֹם could not signify, but by the united influence of the solar heat and the torrid winds. So correctly Bolducius, Ewald, Stickel, Hahn, Delitz., Dillmann [Carey, and, though less decidedly, Wordsworth], except that some of these commentators (Ewald, Dillmann), inappropriately find an ironical meaning in the words [conveyed to some extent also by Carey's paraphrase—"You, Job, can readily enough *feel* the changes of the weather, but you cannot give any explanation of them." The rendering, "How (*i. e.*, dost thou know how) thy garments are warm, when, *etc.*", is certainly insipid enough. In favor of the rendering adopted above see further on ver. 18. The rendering of *b* with E. V., "when He quieteth (Conant, 'lulls') the earth by the south-wind," is admissible, although on account of the absence of the suffix after הַשְׁקִט the subject is more probably ארץ, with the verb in the intransitive sense—to be tranquil, or rather in Hiph. to enjoy tranquillity, to find rest. The appropriateness of the language of this verse as descriptive of summer heat will appear from the following extract from Thomson's *Land and the Book* (Vol. II., p. 312): "The sirocco to-day is of the quiet kind, and they are often more overpowering than the others. I encountered one a year ago on my way from Lydd to Jerusalem. Just such clouds covered the sky, collecting, as these are doing, into darker groups about the tops of the mountains, and a stranger to the country would have expected rain. Pale lightnings played through the air like forked tongues of burnished steel, but there was no thunder and no wind. The heat however became intolerable, and I escaped from the burning highway into a dark-vaulted room at the lower Bethhoron. I then fully understood what Isaiah (ch. xxv. 5), meant when he said, Thou shalt bring down the noise of the strangers as the heat in a dry place, as the heat with the shadow of a cloud—that is, as such heat brings down the noise, and makes the earth quiet—a figure used by Job (ch. xxxvii. 17) when he says, Thy garments are warm when he quieteth the earth by the south wind. We can testify that the garments are not only warm, but *hot*. This sensation of dry hot clothes is only experienced during the siroccos, and on such a day, too, one understands the other effects mentioned by the prophet, bringing down the noise, and *quieting* the earth. There is no living thing abroad to make a noise. The birds hide in thickest shades, the fowls pant under the walls with open mouth and drooping wings, the flocks and herds take shelter in caves and under great rocks, the laborers retire from the fields, and close the windows and doors of their houses, and travelers hasten, as I did, to take shelter in the first cool place they can find. No one has energy enough to make a noise, and the very air is too weak and languid to stir the pendent leaves even of the tall poplars."—E.]

Ver. 18. **Dost thou with him arch over the sky?** *i. e.*, dost thou with Him give its vaulting or out-spanning (Gen. i. 7 sq.) to the firmament of clouds (שְׁחָקִים here essentially as in ch. xxxv. 5), **which is firm as a molten mirror?** רְאִי "mirror," the same as מַרְאָה in Ex. xxxviii. 8. מוּצָק, Partic. Hoph. from יצק (ch. xi. 15), indicating the preparation of the mirror from molten and polished metal. With this representation of the heavenly firmament (רָקִיעַ, στερέωμα), as constituting a smooth, shining, and solid mirror, may be compared, as most nearly resembling it, the representation of

it as transparent sapphire (Ex. xxiv. 10), or, more remotely, as a curtain (Ps. civ. 2) or gauze (Is. xl. 22) or a veil (Ps. cii. 27 [26]). [It should be observed that the description here given of the skies is especially appropriate to the dazzling brilliancy of the oriental sky in summer, whence the well-known comparison of the sky in a season of heat and drought to "brass." It will thus be seen that those two verses, (17 and 18) are in logical connection. Thou who art subject to the influences of the seasons, whose garments are hot in summer, when the earth becomes still from the South, canst thou claim to be associated with Him who spread on high yon blazing canopy, solid and burnished as a molten mirror? the comparison being with the molten metal used as mirrors.—E.]

Ver. 19. **Teach us what we shall say to Him**, the mighty Author and Preserver of this magnificent world-structure?—what we shall say to Him, that is, when we would argue with Him. **We can set forth nothing** (lit. "we cannot —לֹא—set forth," scil. מִלִּים) **by reason of darkness**, *i. e.*, because of the darkness of our understanding; comp. Eccles. ii. 14; Is. lx. 2. In respect to מִפְּנֵי, *præ*, *propter*, comp. chap. xxiii. 17.

Ver. 20. **Shall it be told Him** (יְסֻפַּר optative) **that I would speak?**—["Greatly increased vividness is imparted to the discourse by this sudden transition from the first person plural to the first singular, as though Elihu would realize on the instant, in his own person, all that was fearful in that which he assumes." Schlottmann].—**Or did ever a man wish to be destroyed?** lit., "did he say, that he would be (might become) destroyed?" (comp. xxxiv. 31). This question has for its basis something like the well-known Old Testament idea that "no man could see God and live." See Ex. xix. 21; xxxiii. 20; comp. Gen. xxxii. 30; Judg. vi. 22 seq.; xiii. 22.

Ver. 21 seq. refers again to the storm which during the whole discourse is visible in the heavens, not however with the purpose merely to point it out or describe it, but to use the spectacle which the storm at the moment presents as a symbol of Job's condition and relation to God at the time.

Ver. 21. **And now indeed one sees not the light, which is gleaming brightly** (בָּהִיר only here) **in the clouds**; *i. e.*, which notwithstanding the clouds that veil it, or, which *behind* the clouds shines with its customary brilliancy. **But a wind passeth by and cleareth them away** (dispels these clouds, so that it becomes quite clear again). The meaning of the passage can be only this—that "the God who is hidden only for a time, respecting whom one runs the risk of being in perplexity, can suddenly unveil Himself to our surprise and confusion, and that therefore it becomes us to bow humbly and quietly to His present mysterious visitation" (Delitzsch). To reject this thought, which is so clear, and so strikingly in harmony with the connection, and to substitute for it the other and much more artificial thought—"But now one cannot look upon the sunlight, while it shines clearly in the bright clouds, inasmuch as the wind has passed over it, and cleansed it of all obscurity" (Ros., Hirz., Ew., Dillm., [Schlottmann, Noyes, Conant, Lee, Carey, Wordsworth, Rodwell, Elzas] *etc.*),—is not to assist but to obscure the comprehension of the passage. [The explanation of Delitzsch, adopted by our Commy. does not seem quite as clear as Zöckler represents it. שְׁחָקִים is used by Elihu in two senses: (1) in ch. xxxvi. 28 of the rain-clouds; (2) in ch. xxxvii. 18 of the sky, or firmament. Delitzsch takes it more in the latter sense here, translating: "the sunlight that is bright in the etherial heights." This interpretation however is forbidden by the ותטהרם of *c.* It cannot be said that the wind clears the etherial heights. The suffix evidently shows that the "skies" here spoken of include the lower region of clouds. Moreover the explanation itself requires that somewhere in the verse mention should be made of the lower clouds, which for a time hide the light. But if שְׁחָקִים must include these clouds, which are blown away by the wind, Del.'s explanation becomes inconsistent with the preposition בְּ, which certainly cannot mean, according to Zöckler's suggestion, "*behind* the clouds," or above them. Moreover, as Dillmann justly objects, the aspect in which God is about to be presented is not that of One who, having been hidden for a time suddenly reveals Himself, but rather that of One whose majesty is too terrible for contemplation, and whose greatness is unsearchable. To which add that this is also the prominent thought in the verse just preceding (ver. 20);—God is so great that to approach Him is to risk annihilation. With this thought the other rendering stands in better connection, so that the whole train of thought from ver. 20 on may be freely rendered as follows:—Shall it be announced to Him, the Eternal King, awful in glory, that I would speak to Him? Shall I utter the desire to be ushered unto His presence, whom to see is to perish? Even now men cannot look on the light—the symbol of His glory—as it blazes there in the skies, over which the wind has passed, clearing them up; . . . . much less can they gaze on His terrible majesty! Elihu seems to speak with a presentiment of the approaching presence of God.—E.].

Ver. 22 continues the description in ver 21 *c* of that which follows the obscuration of the sun by thunder-clouds: **From the north comes forth the golden brightness; — around Eloah** (hovers)**· the sublimest splendor.**—These words are referred by most modern commentators (following the Vulg.: *ab aquilone aurum venit*) to the metal gold, which comes out of the lands lying to the north (in favor of which they appeal to Herodotus, III., 116; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, VI., 11; XXXIII., 4), and which accordingly, even if hard to obtain, is nevertheless at all times accessible to men, whereas God's majesty remains forever unapproachable to them. But whether in this view we find the *tertium comparationis* to be the remoteness of the northern lands (Ewald, Hirzel, Vaihinger, Welte) [Schlottmann, Lee, Conant, Dillmann], or the mysterious obscurity which veils them (Stickel, Hahn, Delitzsch), the com-

parison would after all have something frigid about it, would be but ill suited to the present passage, and would agree but poorly with the other intimations of the Old Testament touching commercial geography, which locate the principal mines of gold towards the south rather; comp. ch. xxii. 24; xxviii. 1, 6, 16. The correct rendering has already been indicated by the LXX., who translate זָהָב by νέφη χρυσαυγοῦντα, following which Luther in a marginal gloss explained the term to mean "fair weather like pure gold" [and so E. V.]; and similarly Brentius, Cocceius, Starke, Rosenmüller, Umbreit, Arnheim, and Böttcher (*Aehrenl.*, p. 76), [Noyes, Bernard, Barnes, Good, Wemyss, Carey, Rodwell, Elzas, Renan], but with the subordinate variation among themselves, that some of them explain the זָהָב of the *clear sunlight* breaking forth (Cocceius, *etc.*, Umbreit), others of the *golden-shining clouds*, as the covering of Jehovah appearing in the storm. The latter modification of this meteorological application of the word, in favor of which may be cited that other figurative rendering of the word "gold" which we find in Zech. iv. 12, where gold is used for "pure oil"—must in any case be preferred, because the sun itself could not be described as coming מִצָּפוֹן, and because the explanation of this מִצָּפוֹן as meaning "by means of the north-wind," is altogether too precarious, and equally at variance with usage as Umbreit's translation—"from heaven." The parallel passages produced by Schultens out of Arabic poets, in favor of the comparison of the sunlight with gold, as likewise the Latin expressions *aurea lux, aureus sol*, are however none the less pertinent for illustration (comp. "the golden sunlight" with us), for it still remains true that the sun is the source of the golden splendor, with which a portion of the thunder-clouds is wont to shine forth, when the storm breaks up, and the clouds begin to retire (comp. Brentius below in the Homiletic Remarks on the passage). Moreover according to this explanation the first member of the verse stands to the second in the relation of comparison and preparation. From the north, when the winds scatter the storm (in the direction of the south) there burst forth clouds of light shining with the brilliancy of gold, an emblem of the incomparable majesty and splendor (נוֹרָא הוֹד comp. Ps. civ. 1) of the light in which God is clothed. There is no reference to the ancient mythological conception of God's dwelling-place being in the north (such as Böttcher attributes to the passage), nor to Ezekiel's description of the chariot of cherubim as coming from the north. There may possibly have been certain meteorological causes of a local character, to ascertain which with certainty is beyond our power, which determined the poet to the choice of the expression מִצָּפוֹן, which in any case has about it something singular, susceptible only of imperfect explanation, whether זהב be understood in a mineralogical, or a meteorological sense.

Vers. 23, 24 conclude the entire meditation on God's incomprehensibly great and wonderful operations.

Ver. 23. **The Almighty—we find Him not**—He ever remains for us One who is beyond our reach, both as regards the perception of our senses and of our minds (comp. ch. xxiii. 3), one φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον) 1 Tim. vi. 17). **[Who is great in power], but right and the fulness of justice** (רַב־צְדָקָה, as in ch. xxxiii. 19) **He perverts not**—*i. e.*, with all His incomprehensibleness He still continues ever righteous in His dealings—a proposition which brings the discourse back to its starting-point (ch. xxxvi. 5). The phrase עִנָּה משפט וצד׳ instead of הִטָּה וגו׳, which is usual elsewhere, belongs to the Aramaizing idioms of the discourses of Elihu (comp. the Talmudic עִנָּה דִּין; its non-occurrence elsewhere however does not necessitate that, in disregard of the Masoretic accents, we should connect ומשפט ורב־צדקה with שׂגיא in *b*, in which case the objectless clause לֹא יְעַנֶּה will have to be rendered either—"He does not exercise oppression" (Umbreit, Schlottmann, Kamphausen) [E. V. ("He will not afflict"), Noyes, Conant, Barnes, Bernard, Elzas, Wordsworth, Good—who makes ורב־צ׳ subj.], or as a relative clause—"which He doth not oppress" (Stickel), or after the reading לֹא יַעֲנֶה, "He answereth not, giveth no account of Himself" (LXX., Peshito, Rosenmüller, Hirzel, Vaihinger) [Lee, Carey, Renan, Rodwell]. The explanation of Hahn would seem more natural—"As regards right and the fulness of justice He doth therein no wrong."

Ver. 24. **Therefore do men fear Him**—*i. e.*, men of the right sort, men as they should be, who live in accordance with the precepts of true wisdom (ch. xxviii. 28). The optative rendering of the Perf. (Umbr., Vaihinger, Stickel, Heiligstedt [Good, Lee, Noyes, Carey, Renan, Rodwell], *etc.*) is as unnecessary as the Imperative—"fear Him" is inadmissible, which would have been written יִרְאוּהוּ instead יְרֵאוּהוּ (against Arnheim, Hahn). On the contrary the Perf. is used here as in ch. xxxvi. 24, 25, to denote a public, universally recognized fact of experience. **He doth not look on those who are wise in their own conceit.**—כָּל־חַכְמֵי־לֵב lit. "all the wise of heart," *i. e.*, those who on the ground of their own heart (instead of on the ground of the fear of God) hold themselves to be wise, *omnes qui sibi videntur esse sapientes* (Vulg.). The censorious element of the expression does not lie strictly in לֵב (comp. ch. ix. 4; Prov. xi. 29; xvi. 21), but only in the contrast to the notion of the fear of God expressed in *a*. "Not to look on" any one is, according to ch. xxxv. 13 *b*, to deem him worthy of no notice; of no gracious well-wishing in his behalf. The subject of this verb can be only God; if the conceited were subj., and God the object (Vulg., Rosenmüller, Stickel) [Bernard, Carey] instead of יִרְאֶה the text would read rather יִרְאֻנּוּ. An uncalled-for "disparagement of Job" (Dillmn.), by no means lies in this closing sentence of Elihu's discourses, but simply a final admonition dissuading him from those presumptuous judgments respecting God, and those presumptuous

speeches against God, against which the polemic edge of these discourses had been principally turned, and that with entire justice. ["This is the sum of all that Elihu had to say—that God was original and independent; that He did not ask counsel of men in His dealings; that He was great and glorious, and inscrutable in His plans; and that men therefore should bow before Him with profound submission and adoration. . . . Having illustrated and enforced this sentiment, Elihu, overwhelmed with the awful symbols of the approaching Deity is silent, and God is introduced to close the controversy." Barnes].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The prejudice of modern critics against the contents and significance of Elihu's discourses in general has in many instances betrayed them into judgments immoderately harsh even in respect to this, the last and most glorious of the series. Dillmann, *e. g.*, gives it as his opinion that "if the first part of this long discourse groups together the principal thoughts of Elihu, the second travels a path which the friends have already attempted (*e. g.*, in ch. v., xi., xxv.); and in the remainder of it is evidently based on passages of the discourses of God in chap. xxxviii. seq., the individual beauties of which in their contents and application are thereby in part anticipated. Forasmuch as Dillmann, as appears from his previous discussions, recognizes at the same time in these "principal thoughts of Elihu grouped together in the first part," little or nothing that is original, this opinion of his is as disparaging, not to say contemptuous, as it can well be. Elihu is thereby even in respect to the contents of this his final discourse, reduced to the position of a mere compiler, destitute of independence, who borrows the ideas and beauties of others, and without remarkable skill seeks to elaborate them for his own purpose. We believe that the detailed exegesis which we have given above, and particularly of this same fourth discourse, in which the point under consideration has claimed thorough examination and treatment from us, makes it unnecessary for us now to undertake a special refutation of this and similar objections. We believe that we have shown in respect to the reflections, predominantly ethical and theological, contained in the first part (chap. xxxvi. 5-21), that they repeatedly set forth indeed the fundamental thought of these discourses, to wit, the idea of a remedial purifying and chastening influence of divinely ordained suffering on the pious; that they do this however in a way more impressive and soul-thrilling than any previous portion of the whole book; and that in particular the closing verses of this division (vers. 16-21) contain statements in respect to God's loving treatment in "alluring out of the jaws of distress," in respect to the danger of allowing oneself to be led away from God by the "heat" of suffering, and the greatness of the "ransom" to be paid by means of it, in respect to the insufficiency of our own strivings and conflicts and prayers for procuring salvation, in respect to the natural tendency of the heart to do and to utter vanity rather than to suffer patiently, such as occur in the like combination nowhere in the Old Testament, and such as *belong in truth to the profoundest utterances which the revealed literature of the Old Testament has produced in the attempt to solve the mystery of affliction before the coming of Christ.*

In respect to the Second Part, however, we believe that we have shown:

(1) That the reflections in the sphere of physical theology therein contained, so far from deserving the reproach of lacking originality, form on the contrary a glorification of the majesty of God revealed in nature, which is most harmoniously adjusted in all its parts from beginning to end, poetically lofty and unique of its kind.

(2) That in particular the description of the terrors and beauties of the storm, exhibiting as it does in masterly combination beauties of its own, deserves to be placed beside the most elevated passages of the sort which the Old Testament literature has produced (*e. g.*, Ps. xviii. Ps. xxix. *etc.*), or even surpasses them.

(3) That the independence of the description, as compared with the contents—similar in part—of Jehovah's discourse in ch. xxxviii. seq., is vindicated by the fact that its character is *almost exclusively meteorological*, being limited to the atmospheric phenomena of heat and moisture, and that its objects accordingly coincide only to a limited extent with those of the discourses which follow.

(4) That the supposition—which forces itself upon us with a necessity from which there is no escape—that the magnificent description here given is continued throughout by the sight of an actual storm in the heavens, accompanied by an abundance of the phenomena of thunder and lightning, furnishes a still further and a weighty contribution to the evidence in favor of the originality of the section in relation to what follows.

(5) That, finally, the suggestive conclusion of the whole, where the natural phenomena immediately contemplated are symbolically referred—and that no less naturally than impressively—to God's mysterious operations in respect to Job, prepares the way for the final decisive solution of the whole problem (see especially ch. xxxvii. 21 seq.). The way in which this result is secured banishes the last remnant of doubt touching the genuineness of this section, while at the same time it serves to corroborate the view of this whole Elihu-episode as an essential part of the poet's own artistic plan, and as having a close organic connection with ch. xxxviii. seq. In short we believe that we have shown that the descriptions of nature in the discourse before us may be ranked with the best and most original portions of Holy Scripture of that class. We believe that such a man as Alexander von Humboldt showed neither poor taste nor defective judgment in æsthetic criticism, when in the Second Part of his *Cosmos* (Vol II., p. 414, Bohn's *Scientific Library*) he writes with reference to this very passage: "Similar views of the Cosmos occur repeatedly in the Psalms (Ps. lxv 7 seq.; lxxiv 15 seq.), *and most fully perhaps in the 37th chapter of the ancient, if not ante-Mosaic Book of Job.* The meteorological pro-

cesses which take place in the atmosphere, the formation and solution of vapor, according to the changing direction of the wind, the play of its colors, the generation of hail and of the rolling thunder are described with individualizing accuracy; and many questions are propounded which we in the present state of our physical knowledge may indeed be able to express under more scientific definitions, but scarcely to answer satisfactorily. The book of Job is generally regarded as the most perfect specimen of the poetry of the Hebrews," *etc.*

2. We are constrained to make an observation in opposition to Delitzsch respecting the anthropological, ethical, and soteriological representations of the First Part (and indeed of the whole discourse, for the same representations appear also in the Second Part towards the end; see chap. xxxvii. 12 seq., 19 seq.). When this commentator, who is so highly esteemed on account of his exegesis of this book, maintains (II., p. 307 seq.) that Elihu, as in his discourses generally, so in this final discourse particularly, "takes up a position apart from the rest of the book, in so far as he makes Job's sin the cause of his affliction; while in the idea of the rest of the book Job's affliction *has nothing whatever to do* with Job's sin, except in so far as he allows himself to be drawn into sinful language concerning God by the conflict of temptation into which the affliction plunges him"—we believe that we must reject as a one-sided representation this way of characterizing the distinction between the solution of the great mystery of suffering given by Elihu and that given by God, or taught by the whole poem. We must also charge with one-sidedness the statement which follows in immediate connection with this, that it is only the assumed "older poet" (*i. e.*, the author of the poem as a whole *omitting* Elihu's discourses), and not Elihu, who discusses as his theme the mystery of affliction, because it is the former only who exhibits Job as suffering *wholly* without guilt, or even ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, whereas Elihu "leaves sin and suffering together as inseparable, and opposes the false doctrine of retribution by the distinction between disciplinary chastisement and judicial retribution. We must be permitted to doubt whether on Old Testament grounds a suffering purely on account of righteousness (which under the New Testament would be suffering purely on account of Christ, the genuine suffering of martyrdom) could have been anywhere conceived of, much less set forth with poetic elaboration. For the "evil thought and imagination of man's heart from his youth," together with the "secret faults" without number, and the "errors which cannot be understood"—all this was rooted too firmly and deeply in the consciousness of every thinker within the circle of the Old Testament revelation to admit of the possibility of separating oneself in any measure from this all-embracing sinfulness and guilt which attaches to all who belong to our race. Moreover the actual issue of the action of the poem in ch. xlii. shows clearly enough that the idea that "Job's suffering *had nothing whatever to do* with Job's sin," was not that of the poet. That for which Job is there obliged to repent in dust and ashes is not simply his sinful speaking against God, but beyond question the root, which lay still deeper, of these individual sinful outbreaks—the remainder of unexpiated sin, of inward impurity, not yet wholly removed by purification, from which he suffered, and the presence of which he had repeatedly acknowledged. The mission of Elihu, as appears with pre-eminent clearness from this last discourse of his, is none other than to prove the inseparable connection between those criminal utterances of the sorely-tried sufferer and their deeper ground in the moral nature, and at the same time to prove the unavoidable necessity of suffering for purification, even for the man who is comparatively righteous. In other words Elihu sets forth the educational and remedial value of the afflictions ordained by God for every one who is visited by them, even for him who appears to be most innocent. The course of *his* discussion also rests on the doctrine of affliction, only that he affirms more urgently and emphasizes more strongly the necessity of suffering for all grounded in the sinfulness of all that is done by the discourses of Jehovah These rather lay the chief emphasis on the unfathomableness of the divine purpose in decreeing suffering, as also, in close connection with this, on the object of suffering, which is to cultivate and to confirm the obedience, humility and truth of the pious. In short, that which Elihu seeks to demonstrate is that the significance of Job's suffering is *predominantly that of chastisement and purification;* that to which the conclusion of the whole poem points on the contrary is that its significance is *predominantly that of probation.* There is no absolute contrast, but essentially only a difference of degree between the solution of this problem which Elihu propounds, and the final decision of Jehovah. The former contemplates the affliction laid by God on the pious more with reference to its final and supreme purpose of salvation, or which is the same thing—the former undertakes the solution of the problem from a soteriological stand-point which is in part as yet that of the law, the latter from one that decisively approximates that of the New Testament. Comp. above, Introd. § 10, ad 8.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

In a homiletic respect both divisions of the discourse, the anthropological-ethical and the physico-theological, present, much that is instructive and stimulating. It will be one chief aim of the practical expositor to exhibit vividly and with proper care the reciprocal influence of both elements in treating of such passages as ch. xxxvi. 5, 16, 22 seq.; xxxvii. 5, 12 seq., 19 seq., 22 seq.

Particular Passages.

Chap. xxxvi. 5 seq. ZELTNER: Although God is the Most Mighty One, His wisdom and goodness do not permit that He should reject and condemn any one without cause, by virtue of a bare unconditional decree. His righteousness vindicates itself alike with the evil and the pious. And although in the case of the pious appearances indicate that He has forsaken them, the hour never fails to come at last when He brings

forth their cause, and establishes their right, so that they behold with pleasure His grace —V. GERLACH: Whereas Elihu has previously set forth the retribution of God's righteousness, which without fail overtakes the wicked, so now he here sets forth His gracious fatherly guidance of His servants. He does not cast them off at once on account of their missteps, for He is also "mighty in strength of heart," *i. e.*, His wisdom penetrates all things; He knows therefore how by wondrous ways to lead them to the right goal.

Chap. xxxvi. 8 seq. BRENTIUS: If kings or princes, whether in liberty or in captivity and chains, will not despise the instruction of the Lord, but will rather submit to Him when He admonishes them of those things which are right, and chastises them by affliction, and repent of their wickedness, then shall they find the Lord favorable to them, and ready to forgive whatever iniquities they had before committed. . . . Of this you have an example in Manasseh.—V. ANDREAE: If in the present condition of things in the world the pious must at times languish in misery, this is in order that they may persistently endure in the right way, which conducts them to that blessed goal. He who rebels against these divine methods of treatment, will thereby only forfeit the blessing which is ever consequent upon such suffering.

Chap. xxxvi. 22. OECOLAMPADIUS: The invisible things of God indeed are known from those things which are seen, but all the knowledge which is attainable to us now is imperfect. We see afar off, and in darkness, and through a glass, having a better knowledge of what God is not than of what He is. We are not able to search out His judgments, but we know Him to be the Most High, and the Incomprehensible One. However much accordingly philosophers may dispute about the way in which snow, rain, lightning, thunderbolts are produced, they are nevertheless wholly ignorant by what decree of God they are brought into being. It is otherwise however that our theologian [Elihu] discourses concerning the secrets of nature. He does it in order that in them the righteousness of God may be observed, showing kindness to some, afflicting others. But by God's appointment all things are ordered for good to those who are good, at the same time that all creatures work evil to those who are evil. ANDREAE: The same storm which on the one side is sent upon the lands for punishment and destruction is at the same time appointed on the other side to bless them abundantly, and to make them fruitful. Thus even the severest judgments of God are ever to be regarded as at the same time a source out of which divine grace distils forth.

Chap. xxxvii. 1 seq. CRAMER: Thunder, lightning, and storms, are to be our open-air preachers, and preachers of repentance.—They are God's regalia, and emblems of His divine majesty.—STARKE: When God thunders, He, as it were, speaks to us in wrath (Ex. xx. 19). God would have us recognize Him even out of the storm, and all the more at such a time pray to Him and fear Him as the true God. . . . In a heavy thunder-storm every one should humble himself before God, and cry to Him, beseeching Him to take us and ours into His gracious protection.—WOHLFARTH: Although we no longer, like the ancients, find a sign of the personal and visible nearness of God in the fearfully beautiful natural phenomenon of a storm, but would fain explain this (completely?) by the laws of nature, it declares to us nevertheless the God of power, wisdom, and goodness, and disposes us to the worship of Him, who gave to nature her laws. . . . If by its terrors the storm first of all declares to us God's majesty, and with earnest warning points us to the day of judgment, when mighty princes will tremble like the least of their subjects, it at the same time declares to us the wisdom and goodness of the Most High.*

Chap. xxxvii. 16 seq. WEIM. BIBEL: God's works and wonders, which lie in nature and which come to pass daily, are rightly perceived and learned only by believers, for it is they who by the contemplation of such works are aroused to give praise to God.—COCCEIUS: If in other matters, which happen every day, man is not summoned by God to act as His umpire and counsellor, and if no one can demand that this should be done, nor presume to murmur against such an arrangement, it is just that man should not require of God that the reason of the divine administration in this world should in like manner be made known to him, but that he should acquiesce in it whether he understands it or not, that he should trust God's word, and in patience await His blessing.

Chap. xxxvii. 21 seq. BRENTIUS: The true light, which is God, cannot be seen, neither does it present itself to eyes of flesh. We see indeed a certain splendor of the clouds, we see the light of the sun, when the clouds are scattered by the winds, we see also gold coming from the North; *i. e.*, we see the clouds, resplendent as with gold, and bright serenity, proceeding from the North. All these are spectacles from which the pious mind rises to the praise of the great and terrible God; and as the heavens declare the glory of God, so men from the divine works may recognize and glorify the true God.—UMBREIT: The comparison here given is incomplete, but may easily be understood, and may be more particularly set forth thus: As the sunlight, when it suddenly bursts forth from behind a thick veil of clouds, dazzles and blinds men's eyes, so also would the hidden majesty of God, if once it were revealed in all its glory to mortal man, veil his vision with darkness.

---

* There is much on these points of practical utility accompanied indeed by much which scientifically considered is untenable, absurd, and curious, in the older works on Natural Theology, by Scheuchzer (*Physica Sacra*, I., c, 12), Schmidt (*Bibl. Physicus*, p. 112 seq.), J. A. Fabricius (*Pyrotheologie, oder anweisung zur Erkuntniss Gottes aus Betrachtung des Feuers*, as an Appendix to Will. Derham's *Astrotheologie, etc.*, Hamburg, 1765); P. P. Ahlwardt, (*Brontotheologia; Betrachtungen über Blitz und Donner*, Gresswald, 1745), *etc.*

The Third Stage of the Disentanglement.

CHAPTER XXXVIII. 1—XLII. 6.

JEHOVAH'S DISCOURSE.—The aim of which is to prove that the Almighty and Only Wise God, with whom no mortal man should dispute, might also ordain suffering simply to prove and test the righteous: (Second Half of the positive solution of the problem.)

CHAP. XXXVIII. 1—XL. 5.

First Discourse of Jehovah (together with Job's answer): With God, the Almighty and Only Wise, no man may dispute. Chap. XXXVIII. 1—XL. 5.

1. *Introduction:* **The appearance of God; His demand that Job should answer Him.**

CHAP. XXXVIII. 1-3.

1 Then the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said:

2 Who is this that darkeneth counsel
by words without knowledge?
3 Gird up now thy loins like a man;
for I will demand of thee, and answer thou Me!

2. **God's questions touching His power revealed in the wonders of creation.**

CHAP. XXXVIII. 4—XXXIX. 30.

a. Questions respecting the process of creation:

VERS. 4-15.

4 Where wast thou, when I laid the foundations of the earth?
declare, if thou hast understanding.
5 Who hath laid the measure thereof, if thou knowest?
or who hath stretched the line upon it?
6 Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened?
or who laid the corner-stone thereof:
7 when the morning-stars sang together,
and all the sons of God shouted for joy?

8 Or who shut up the sea with doors,
when it brake forth, as if it had issued out of the womb?
9 When I made the cloud the garment thereof,
and thick darkness a swaddling-band for it;
10 and brake up for it my decreed place,
and set bars and doors,
11 and said, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further;
and here shall thy proud waves be stayed?

12 Hast thou commanded the morning since thy days;
and caused the day spring to know his place;
13 that it might take hold of the ends of the earth,
that the wicked might be shaken out of it?
14 It is turned as clay to the seal;
and they stand as a garment.
15 And from the wicked their light is withholden,
and the high arm shall be broken.

b. Respecting the inaccessible depths and heights below and above the earth, and the forces proceeding from them.

VERS. 16-27.

16 Hast thou entered into the springs of the sea?
or hast thou walked in the search of the depth?
17 Have the gates of death been opened unto thee?
or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow of death?
18 Hast thou perceived the breadth of the earth?
declare if thou knowest it all.

19 Where is the way where light dwelleth?
and as for darkness, where is the place thereof,
20 that thou shouldest take it to the bound thereof,
and that thou shouldest know the paths to the house thereof?
21 Knowest thou it because thou wast then born?
or because the number of thy days is great?

22 Hast thou entered into the treasures of the snow?
or hast thou seen the treasures of the hail,
23 which I have reserved against the time of trouble,
against the day of battle and war?
24 By what way is the light parted,
which scattereth the east wind upon the earth?

25 Who hath divided a water-course for the overflowing of waters,
or a way for the lightning of thunder;
26 to cause it to rain on the earth, where no man is;
on the wilderness, wherein there is no man;
27 to satisfy the desolate and waste ground;
and to cause the bud of the tender herb to spring forth?

c. Respecting the phenomena of the atmosphere, and the wonders of the starry heavens.

VERS. 28-38.

28 Hath the rain a father?
or who hath begotten the drops of dew?
29 Out of whose womb came the ice?
and the hoary frost of heaven, who hath gendered it?
30 The waters are hid as with a stone,
and the face of the deep is frozen.

31 Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades,
or loose the bands of Orion?
32 Canst thou bring forth Mazzaroth in his season?
or canst thou guide Arcturus with his sons?
33 Knowest thou the ordinances of heaven?
canst thou set the dominion thereof in the earth

34 Canst thou lift up thy voice to the clouds,
that abundance of waters may cover thee?
35 Canst thou send lightnings, that they may go,
and say unto thee, Here we are?

36 Who hath put wisdom in the inward parts?
or who hath given understanding to the heart?
37 Who can number the clouds in wisdom?
or who can stay the bottles of heaven,
38 when the dust groweth into hardness,
and the clods cleave fast together?

d. Respecting the preservation and propagation of wild animals, especially of the lion, raven, wild goat, oryx, ostrich, war-horse, hawk, and eagle.

CHAP. XXXVIII. 39—XXXIX. 30.

39 Wilt thou hunt the prey for the lion?
or fill the appetite of the young lions,
40 when they couch in their dens,
and abide in the covert to lie in wait?
41 Who provideth for the raven his food?
when his young ones cry unto God,
they wander for lack of meat.

CHAP. XXXIX.

1 Knowest thou the time when the wild goats of the rock bring forth?
or canst thou mark when the hinds do calve?
2 Canst thou number the months that they fulfil?
or knowest thou the time when they bring forth?
3 They bow themselves, they bring forth their young ones,
they cast out their sorrows.
4 Their young ones are in good liking, they grow up with corn;
they go forth, and return not unto them.

5 Who hath sent out the wild ass free?
or who hath loosed the bands of the wild ass?
6 Whose house I have made the wilderness,
and the barren land his dwellings.
7 He scorneth the multitude of the city,
neither regardeth he the crying of the driver.
8 The range of the mountains is his pasture,
and he searcheth after every green thing.

9 Will the unicorn be willing to serve thee,
or abide by thy crib?
10 Canst thou bind the unicorn with his band in the furrow?
or will he harrow the valleys after thee?
11 Wilt thou trust him because his strength is great?
or wilt thou leave thy labor to him?
12 Wilt thou believe him, that he will bring home thy seed,
and gather it into thy barn?

13 Gavest thou the goodly wings unto the peacocks?
or wings and feathers unto the ostrich?
14 Which leaveth her eggs in the earth,
and warmeth them in the dust,
15 and forgetteth that the foot may crush them,
or that the wild beast may break them.
16 She is hardened against her young ones, as though they were not hers:
her labor is in vain without fear;
17 because God hath deprived her of wisdom,
neither hath He imparted unto her understanding.
18 What time she lifteth up herself on high,
she scorneth the horse and his rider.

19 Hast thou given the horse strength?
hast thou clothed his neck with thunder?
20 Canst thou make him afraid as a grasshopper?
the glory of his nostrils is terrible.

21 He paweth in the valley, and rejoiceth in his strength:
he goeth on to meet the armed men.
22 He mocketh at fear, and is not affrighted;
neither turneth he back from the sword.
23 The quiver rattleth against him,
the glittering spear and the shield.
24 He swalloweth the ground with fierceness and rage;
neither believeth he that it is the sound of the trumpet.
25 He saith among the trumpets, Ha, ha!
and he smelleth the battle afar off,
the thunder of the captains, and the shouting.

26 Doth the hawk fly by thy wisdom,
and stretch her wings toward the south?
27 Doth the eagle mount up at thy command,
and make her nest on high?
28 She dwelleth and abideth on the rock,
upon the crag of the rock and the strong place.
29 From thence she seeketh the prey,
and her eyes behold afar off.
30 Her young ones also suck up blood;
and where the slain are, there is she.

3. *Conclusion of the discourse*, **together with Job's answer, announcing his humble submission.**

CHAPTER XL. 1–5.

CHAP. XL.

1 And Jehovah answered Job, and said,
2 Shall he that contendeth with the Almighty instruct Him?
he that reproveth God, let him answer it.
3 Then Job answered the Lord, and said,
4 Behold, I am vile; what shall I answer thee?
I will lay mine hand upon my mouth.
5 Once have I spoken, but I will not answer:
yea, twice; but I will proceed no further.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. The appearance of God, which Job had again and again expressly wished for, a wish which recurs in ch. xxiii. 3 seq., and especially towards the end of his last discourse (ch. xxxi. 35), and for which Elihu's preaching of doctrine and of repentance had prepared the way—this appearance now takes place during that storm, of fearful beauty, which had supplied the last of Elihu's discourses with the material for its impressive descriptions of the greatness of God in His works. This Divine manifestation, which is not to be understood as taking place corporeally in a human form; see on ch. xxxviii. 1—corresponds moreover to the preparatory representations proceeding from Elihu in this respect, that like those representations it bears testimony at the same time *in behalf of* Job and *against* him. It testifies *for* Job in that it brings about the actual realization of the ardent longing which he had so often uttered, and in that it is *not* accompanied by that terrifying and crushing effect on the bold challenger which he himself had several times dreaded as possible (ch. ix. 34; xiii. 21; xxiii. 6), and had on that account deprecated. It testifies *against* him by means of the deep humiliation which the majesty of the Almighty occasions to him, by means of the consciousness wrought within him of his own insignificance and limitation in contrast with this fulness of power and wisdom, and by means of the principle which in this very way is brought forth into full expression, and which is expressly acknowledged by him at the close of this first address of Jehovah—the principle, namely, that from henceforth he must lay aside entirely all condemnation of God's ways, and be willing to submit himself in absolute humility to His decree. —Again the rich illustration, elaborated in the most elevated style of poetic discourse, which in this first address God gives of His all-transcending majesty in contrast with man's insignificance (chs. xxxviii. 4—xxxix. 30) is also such as testifies at once *for* and *against* Job, and thus continues with increased emphasis the strain already begun by Elihu (especially in his fourth discourse). On the one side it serves to confirm the previous descriptions given by Job himself of God's greatness, wonderful power, and plenitude of wisdom; on the other side it transcends the same in the incomparably more elevated and impressive power of its representation, under

the influence of which the last remainder of insolent pride still adhering to Job must of necessity dissolve and disappear. The discourse forms *one* well-conceived, harmoniously constructed whole, consisting of two principal divisions of almost equal length, of which the first (ch. xxxviii. 4-38) refers to the creation and to inanimate nature, the second (chs. xxxviii. 39; xxxix. 30) to the animal kingdom, as sources of evidence proving the divine majesty. It is not necessary to resolve these two divisions into two separate discourses, as is done by Köster and Schlottmann, the former of whom even deems it necessary to resort to the violent operation of transposing the conclusion in ch. xl. 1–5, and putting it after ch. xxxviii. 36.—Each of these divisions may be subdivided into three strophe-groups, or long strophes, consisting of 11–12 verses each, which may again be subdivided, according to the subjects described, into subordinate strophes or paragraphs, now longer and now shorter. Of these simple, short strophes the three long strophes of the first principal division (*a*, *b* and *c*) contain respectively three to four, whereas the last two long strophes, at least of the second chief division, which dwell on themes derived from the animal world, consist of but two short strophes respectively.

2. *The Introduction:* ch. xxxviii. 1–3.—**Then Jehovah answered Job out of the storm.** —The "answering" or "replying" refers back to Job's repeated challenges, and especially to the last, found in ch. xxxi. 35: "Let the Almighty answer me!"—מִנְהַסְּעָרָה (here, as also in ch. xl. 6 with medial נ; comp. Ewald, § 9, 11, *c* [Green, § 4, *a*]; which the K'ri in both cases sets aside) "out of the storm (thunderstorm);" not (as Luther translates) "out of a storm." It is beyond question an unsatisfactory explanation of the definite article to say that as applied to סערה it means that storm which "always, or as a rule, is wont to announce and to accompany the appearance of God, whenever He draws nigh to the earth in majesty and in the character of a judge" (Dillmann). In view of the way in which the most ancient Old Testament sources describe the theophanies of the patriarchal age in general, this generic rendering of the article is not at all suitable (comp. also 1 Kings xix. 11: "the Lord was *not* in the wind"). The only explanation of the הסערה here, as well as in ch. xl. 6, which is linguistically and historically satisfactory, is that which finds in it a reference to Elihu's description of a violent thunder-storm in his last discourse (ch. xxxvi. 37)—a reference which at the same time confirms not only our interpretation of this discourse given above, but also its genuineness, and the authenticity of Elihu's discourses in general. Placing ourselves (along with the commentators cited above on ch. xxxvi.) on this, the only correct point of view, we see at once the impossibility of viewing "God's speaking out of the storm" as taking place through a corporeal appearance of Jehovah in human form. On the contrary, precisely in the same way that Elihu's description pre-supposed only an invisible approach and manifestation of God in the storm-clouds, in their thunder and lightning, so also here a similar presence and self-manifestation of the Highest is intended, taking place under the veil of those mighty phenomena of nature; hence only a symbolical, not a corporeal appearance of God. For this reason we may with some propriety describe the solution of the whole problem of our poem which is introduced by this divine appearance as "a solution *in the consciousness*" (Delitzsch). In any case the theophany which effects it is to be conceived of as one in which God "drew near to the earth *veiled*, perceptible indeed to the ear, and in His shining veil visible to the eye, but nevertheless veiled, and not presenting a bodily appearance" (Ewald). [In accordance with the explanation given above of ch. xxxvii. 21, 22, the סערה out of which Jehovah speaks is not to be limited to the storm while raging, but refers rather to "the dark materials of the storm now pacified," the mountainous cloud-masses in the north, which having spent their thunder, were now looming up in "terrible majesty," while their open rifts disclosed the golden irradiation of the sunlight, a scene we may suppose not unlike that described by Wordsworth near the close of the Second Book of the Excursion. Such a scene, just preceded as it had been by the awe-inspiring phenomena of the storm at its height would fitly usher in the Divine Presence, from which the words which are to end the controversy are about to proceed.—E.]

Ver. 2. **Who is this that darkens counsel:** lit. "who is this, who is here (מִי זֶה, comp. Gesenius, § 122 [§ 120], 2) darkening counsel?" עֵצָה without the article (instead of הָעֵצָה, or instead of עֲצָתִי) is used intentionally in order to describe that which is darkened by Job qualitatively, as something "which is a counsel (or a plan)," as opposed to a whim, or a cruel caprice, such as Job had represented God's dealings with him as being. ["Two things are implied in what is here said to Job: that his suffering is founded on a plan of God's, and that he by his perverse speeches is guilty of distorting and mistaking this plan (in representing it as caprice without a plan)." Dillm. Job's ignorant words had "darkened" God's plan by *obscuring* or keeping out of sight its intelligent benevolent features]. The participle מַחְשִׁיךְ is used rather than the Perf., because down to the very end of his speaking Job had misunderstood God's counsel, and even during Elihu's discourses he had recalled nothing of what he had said in this particular. For to the instruction and reproofs of this last speaker he had made no other response than persistent profound silence. He actually appeared accordingly at the moment when Jehovah himself began to speak as still a "darkener of counsel," however true it might be that his conversion to a better frame of mind had already begun inwardly to take place under the influence of the addresses of his predecessor. This participle מַחְשִׁיךְ accordingly furnishes no argument against the genuineness of chap. xxxii.–xxxvii. (against Ewald, Delitzsch, Dillmann, *etc.*): and all the less seeing that a direct interruption of Job at the moment when he had last spoken contentiously and censoriously in respect

to God's plan (ch. xxxi. 35 seq.) by the appearance of God cannot be intended even if these chapters were in fact not genuine (comp. remarks on that passage). And especially would the assumption that the interpolator of the Elihu discourses had been prompted by this expression, מַחְשִׁיךְ, purposely to avoid introducing Job within the limits of that section as making any confession whatever of his penitence, presuppose on the part of the interpolator a degree of artistic deliberation, nay more, of crafty cunning absolutely without a parallel in the entire Bible literature.

Ver. 3. **Gird up now thy loins like a man**—*i. e.*, in preparation for the contest with me (comp. ch. xii. 21). According to *b* this contest is to consist in a series of questions to be addressed by God to Job and to be answered by the latter; hence formally or apparently in the very thing which Job himself had in ch. xiii. 22 wished for; in reality however God so overwhelms him by the humiliating contents of these questions that the absolute inequality of the contending parties and Job's guilt become apparent at once.

3. *The argument.* *a.* God's questions respecting *the process of creation:* vers. 4-15. [This division consists of three minor strophes of four verses each, the fourth verse in each forming, as Schlottmann observes, a climax in the thought].

α. Questions touching *the foundation of the earth:* vers. 4-7.

Ver. 4. **Where wast thou when I founded the earth?** (A question similar to that of Eliphaz above: ch. xv. 7 seq.). **Declare it if thou hast understanding**—to wit, of the way in which this process was carried on. This same *How* of the process of founding the earth is also the unexpressed object of הַגֵּד "declare!" In respect to יָדַע בִּינָה, "to have an understanding of anything," comp. Is. xxix. 24; Prov. iv. 1; 2 Chron. ii. 12.

Ver. 5. **Who hath fixed its measure that thou shouldest know it?**—כִּי תֵדָע, not: "for thou surely knowest it" (Schlottmann) [Good, Lee, Barnes, Carey, Renan, Elzas], but "so that thou shouldest know it" (כִּי as in ch. iii. 12). [Dillmann objects to the rendering, "for thou knowest," that the verb should be in that case יָדַעְתָּ; an objection which may also be urged against the rendering of E. V., Sept., Vulg., Umbreit, Rosenmüller, Bernard, "if thou knowest." Compare אִם יָדַעְתָּ in ver. 4 *b*.]. "The מִי inquires not after the person of the Architect, the same being sufficiently known, but rather after His character, and that of His activity:—what kind of a being must He be who could fix the earth's measure like that of a building?" (Dillmann).

Ver. 6. **Whereon were its pillars sunken**—*i. e.*, on what kind of a foundation? אֲדָנִים lit. "pedestals," comp. Ex. xxvi. 19 seq.; Canticles v. 15. The meaning of the question is of course that already indicated in ch. ix. 6, and xxvi. 7, according to which passages the earth hangs free in space. The question in *b* refers to the same thing: "or who laid down her corner-stone?" where the "laying down" (יָרָה, *jacere*) of the corner-stone points to the wonderful ease with which the entire work was accomplished.

Ver. 7. **When the morning-stars sang out together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.**—The Infinitive רָן is continued in *b* by the finite verb, as in ver. 13, and often. The whole description determines the time of the fact of the founding of the earth (*καταβολὴ κόσμου*) spoken of in ver. 6. The founding is here set forth as a festal celebration (comp. Ezra iii. 10; Zech. iv. 7) attended by all the heavenly hosts, which are here mentioned by the double designation "sons of God" (comp. ch. i. 6; ii. 1) and "morning stars, *i. e.*, creatures of such glory, that they surpass all other creatures of God in the same way that the brightness of the morning-star (כּוֹכַב בֹּקֶר=הֵילֵל, Is. xiv. 12, *Lucifer*) eclipses all the other stars. As another example of this generic generalized form of expression here found in the word "morning-stars," compare the כְּסִילִים of Is. xiii. 10, *i. e.*, the Orion-like constellations. The expression "morning-stars" moreover is scarcely to be understood as a tropical designation of that which is literally designated by the expression "sons of God," that is to say, the angels (Hirzel, Dillmann [Carey, Wemyss, Barnes] *etc.*) Rather are the angels and stars mentioned together here in precisely the same way that in chap. xv. 15 "heaven" and "the holy ones" of God are mentioned together, this being in accordance with the mysterious connection which the Holy Scriptures generally set forth as existing between the starry and angelic worlds (comp. also on ch. xxv. 5). Such a representation of the brightly shining and joyously "jubilating" stars (comp. Ps. xix. 2; cxlviii. 3) as present when the earth was founded by God by no means contradicts the Mosaic account of creation in Gen. i. where verse 14 (according to which the sun, moon and stars were not made until the fourth day) is assuredly to be interpreted phenomenally, not as descriptive of the literal fact.

β. Questions respecting the shutting up of the sea within bounds: vers. 8–11.

Ver. 8. **And** (who) **shut up the sea with doors?**—וַיָּסֶךְ, which is attached to מִי יָרָה in ver. 6, is used with reference to the waters of the sea in the newly-created earth, which at first wildly swelling and raging had in consequence to be enclosed, penned up, as it were, behind the doors (comp. ch. iii. 23) of a prison (comp. Gen. i. 2, 9 seq.). The second member introduces a clause determining the time of the first which continues to the end of ver. 11.—**When it burst forth, came out from the womb**—*i. e.*, out of the interior of the earth (comp. ver. 16). The verb גִּיחַ, which is used in Ps. xxii 10 [9] of the bursting forth of the fœtus out of the womb, is explained by the less bold word יֵצֵא (which follows the Infinitive in the same way as the finite verb above in ver. 7). The representation of the earth as the womb, out of which the waters of the sea burst forth, seems to contradict the modern geological theory, which on

the contrary makes the earth to emerge out of the primitive sea, which enveloped and covered everything. But the science of geology recognizes not only elevations, but *depressions by sinking* of land or mountain masses (comp. Friedr. Pfaff, *Das Wasser*, Munich, 1870, p. 250 seq.). Especially do the recent "Deep Sea Explorations," as they are called, seem to be altogether favorable to the essential correctness of the biblical view presented here and also in Gen. vii. 11; viii. 2, which regards the interior of the earth as originally occupied by water (comp. Pfaff, p. 90 seq.; Hermann Gropp, *Untersuchungen und Erfahrungen über das Verhalten des Grundwassers und der Quellen*, Lippstadt, 1868).

Ver 9. **When I made the cloud its garment,** *etc.* A striking poetic description of that which in Gen. ii. 6 seq. is narrated in historic prose. In respect to חֲתֻלָּה, "wrapping, swaddling-cloth," comp. the corresponding verb in Ezek. xvi. 4. [By this expression the ocean is obviously compared to a babe. "God thus in grand language expresses how manageable was the ocean to *Him*." Carey].

Ver. 10. **And brake for it** (lit. "over it") **my bound,** *etc.* The verb שָׁבַר which is not here equivalent to גזר, "to appoint," as Arnheim, Wette, Hahn [Lee, Bernard, Noyes, Conant, Wemyss, Barnes, Renan] think, [or according to Rosenmüller, Umbreit, Carey, "to span," after the Arabic] vividly portrays the abrupt fissures of the sea-coast, which is often so high and steep. Comp. the Homeric ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης. On חֹק, "bound," comp. ch. xxvi. 10; Prov. viii. 29; Jer. v. 22. On *b* comp. ver. 8 *a*.

Ver. 11. **Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further** (וְלֹא תֹסִיף scil. לָבוֹא); **here let one set against the pride of thy waves,** scil. "a dam, a bound." The verb יָשִׁית, "let one place" is used passively [and impersonally] for "let there be placed" (comp. Gesen. § 137 [§ 134]). It is not necessary, with the Vulg. and Pesh. to read תָּשִׁית, "here shalt thou stay the pride of thy waves," or, with Codurcus, Ewald, and others to make פֹּא the subj. (in the sense of "this place"). On the pride of the waves" ="proud waves," comp. Ps. lxxxix. 10 [9].

γ. *Questions respecting the regular advance of the light of morning upon the earth:* vers. 12-15. ["The transition from the sea to the morning is not so abrupt as it appears. For the ancients supposed that the sun sets in the ocean, and at his rising comes out of it again." Noyes. "Here with genuine poetry the dawn sending forth its rays upon the earth immediately after creation is represented in its regular recurrence and in its moral significance. This member accordingly forms the transition to the following strophe; it is however first of all the logical conclusion of the first." Schlottmann].

Ver. 12. **Hast thou since thy birth** (lit. "from thy days") **commanded the morning** (*i. e.*, to arise at its time), **made known to the dawn its place,** (lit. "made the dawn to know its place"). Instead of the K'thibh, יִדַּעְתָּה שַׁחַר it is certainly admissible to read with the K'ri יִדַּעְתָּ הַשַּׁחַר; the anarthrous בֹּקֶר of the first member by no means requires us to remove the definite article from the dawn, which is always only *one*. ["The mention of its '*place*' here seems to be an allusion to the fact that it does not always occupy the same position. At one season of the year it appears on the equator, at another north, at another south of it, and is constantly varying its position. Yet it always knows its *place*. It never fails to appear where by the long-observed laws it ought to appear." Barnes].

Ver. 13. **That it may take hold on the borders** (or "fringes") **of the earth.** The surface of the earth is conceived of as an outspread carpet, of the ends of which the dawn as it were takes hold all together as it rises suddenly and spreads itself rapidly (comp. ch. xxxvii. 3; Ps. cxxxix. 9), and this with the view of shaking out of it "the wicked, the evil-doers who, dreading the light, ply their business upon it by night;" *i. e.*, of removing them from it *at once*. The passage contains an unmistakable allusion to Job's own previous description in ch. xxiv. 13 seq. God, anticipating herein in a certain measure the contents of His second discourse, would give Job to understand "how through the original order of creation as established by Himself human wrong is ever annulled again") Ewald. Comp. also v. 15).

Ver. 14. **That it may change like signet-clay**—*i. e.*, the earth (γῆ σημαντρίς, *Herod.* II. 38), which during the night is, as it were, a shapeless mass, like unsealed wax, but which, in the bright light of the morning, reveals the entire beauty of its changing forms, of its heights and depths, *etc.* The subj. of יִתְיַצְּבוּ is to be sought neither in the "morning" and "day-spring" of ver. 12 (Schultens, Rosenmüller), which is altogether too far removed from this clause, nor in the "borders" of ver. 13 (Ewald), but in the particular things found on the earth's surface. The effect of the morning on them is that "they set themselves forth (or, *all* sets itself forth) like a garment," *i. e.*, in all the manifold variegated forms and colors of gay apparel.

Ver. 15. **From the wicked their light is withheld**—*i. e.*, the darkness of the night with which they are so familiar [and which is to them what light is to others], comp. ch. xxiv. 16 seq. (Delitz.: "the light to which they are partial" [*ihr Lieblingslicht*]). **And the uplifted arm** (is) **broken**—*i. e.*, figuratively, in the sense that the light of the day compels it to desist from the violence, to fulfil which it had raised itself (comp. ch. xxii. 8).

4. *Continuation: b.* Questions respecting the heights and depths above and below the earth, and the natural forces proceeding from them: vers. 16-27.

a. The depths *under* the earth: vers 16-18.

Ver. 16. **Hast thou come to the well-springs of the sea?**—*i. e.*, to those "fountains of the deep" of which the Mosaic account of the Flood makes mention; Gen. vii. 11; viii. 2 (comp. above on ver. 8). The phrase נִבְכֵי־יָם, found only here, is not, with Olshausen and

Hitzig, to be changed into נִבְלִים, for the root נבך is evidently only a harsher variation of נבע, and so beyond a doubt expresses the notion of "welling, springing." Thus correctly the LXX: πηγὴ θαλάσσης. [Jarchi, followed by Bernard, Lee, (and see Ewald and Schlottmann) defines נבכים to mean "entanglements, mazes" (comp. בוך); but this meaning is less probable than the one more commonly received after the Sept.] — In respect to חֵקֶר in *b*, comp. above, ch. viii. 8; xi. 7.

Ver. 17. **Have the gates of death opened themselves to thee,** *etc.*—Comp. ch. xxvi. 6, where the mention of the realm of the dead follows that of the sea precisely as here. On "death," as meaning the realm of the dead, comp. ch. xxviii. 22; and on צלמות in the same sense, see ch. x. 21 seq.

Ver. 18. **Hast thou made an examination unto the breadths of the earth.**—התבונן עד signifies, as also in chap. xxxii. 12, "to attend to anything strictly, to take a close observation of anything," the עד indicating that this observation is complete, that it penetrates through to the extreme limit. The interrogative ה is omitted before הִתְבֹּנַנְתָּ, in order to avoid the concurrence of the two aspirates (Ewald, § 324, *b*). On *b* comp. ver. 4, כֻּלָּהּ refers not to the earth, but in the neuter sense, to the things spoken of in the questions just asked. ["To see the force of this (question), we must remember that the early conception of the earth was that it was a vast plain, and that in the time of Job its limits were unknown." Barnes. "Too much stress is commonly laid on the fact that when the poet wrote this, only a small part of the earth was known. Unquestionably the consciousness of the limitation of man's vision was in some respects strengthened by that fact; but that which is properly the main point here, to wit, the inability of man, at one glance to compass the whole earth and all its hidden depths retains all its ancient stress in connection with the widest geographical acquaintance with the surface of the earth." Schlottmann].

β. The heights of light *above* the earth: vers. 19-21.

Ver. 19. **What is the way** (thither, where) **the light dwells.**—On the relative clause יִשְׁכָּן אוֹר comp. Ges. § 123 [§ 121], 3, *c*. On *b*, comp. ch. xxviii. 1-12. The meaning of the whole verse is as follows: Both light and darkness have a first starting point or a final outlet, which is unapproachable to man, and unattainable to his researches. ["As in Gen. i., the light is here regarded as a self-subsistent, natural force, independent of the heavenly luminaries by which it is transmitted: and herein modern investigation agrees with the direct observations of antiquity." Schlottm.]

Ver. 20. **That Thou mightest bring them** (light and darkness) **to their bound** [lit. "it to its bound," the subjects just named considered separately]. כִּי as above in ver. 5. לקח lit. "to bring, to fetch;" comp. Gen. xxvii. 13; xlii. 16; xlviii. 9.—**And that thou shouldest know the paths of their house,** *i. e.* "to their home, their abiding place" (comp. ch. xxviii. 23). It is possible that by this "knowing about the paths of their house" is meant taking *back* [escorting home] the light and darkness, just as in the first member mention is made of fetching, bringing them *away;* for the repetition of כִּי seems to indicate that the meaning of the two halves of the verse is not identical (Dillmann).

Ver. 21 is evidently intended ironically: **Thou knowest, for then wast thou born,** *i. e.* at the time when light and darkness were created, and their respective boundaries were determined. The meaning is essentially the same as in ch. xv. 7. On the Imperf. with אָז comp. Gesenius, § 127 [§ 125], 4, *a;* Ewald, § 136, *b*.—**And the number of thy days is many.**—The attraction in connection with מִסְפַּר as in ch. xv. 20; xxi. 21. [The interrogative rendering of this verse, as in E. V.: "Knowest thou it, because thou wast then born?" *etc.*, is excessively flat. It may be undesirable, as Barnes says, "to represent God as speaking in the language of irony and sarcasm, unless the rules of interpretation imperatively demand it." But humiliating irony surely accords better with the dignity and character of the speaker, as well as with the connection, than pointless insipidity.—E.]

γ. Snow and hail, light and wind: vers. 22-24.

Ver. 22. **Hast thou come to the treasuries of the snow?** Comp. on ch. xxxvii. 9. The figure of the "treasuries" (אֹצְרוֹת, magazines, storehouses) vividly represents the immense quantities in which snow and hail are wont to fall on the earth; comp. Ps. cxxxv. 7.

Ver. 23 gives the purpose and rule of the Divine Government of the world, which snow and hail are constrained to subserve.—**Which I have reserved for the time of distress.**—Such an עֵת צָר (comp. ch. xv. 24; xxxvi. 16) may be caused in the east not only by a hailstorm (Ex. ix. 22; Hag. ii. 17; Sir. xxxix. 29), but even by a fall of snow. In February, 1860, innumerable herds of sheep, goats and camels, and also many men, were destroyed in Hauran by a snow-storm, in which snow fell in enormous quantities, as described by Muhammed el-Chatib el-Bosrawi in a writing still in the possession of Consul Wetzstein (Delitzsch).—The second member refers to such cases as Josh. x. 11 (comp Is. xxviii. 17; xxx. 30; Ezek. xiii. 13; Ps. lxviii. 15 [14]; 1 Sam. vii. 10; 2 Sam. xxiii. 20), where violent hail or thunder-storms contributed to decide the issues of war in accordance with the divine decrees.

Ver. 24. **What is the way to where the light is parted [where] the east wind spreadeth over the earth.**—The construction as in ver. 19 *a*. The light and the east wind (*i. e.* a violent wind, a storm in general, comp. ch. xxvii. 21) are here immediately joined together, because the course of both these agents defies calculation, and because they are incredibly swift in their movements [possibly also because they both proceed from the same point

of the compass]. אוֹר scarcely denotes the lightning, as in ch. xxxvii. 3 seq. (Schlottmann), which is first spoken of in ver. 25, and then again in ver. 35, and to which the verb יחלק, "divides, scatters itself," is less suitable than to the bright day-light (comp. ver. 13 seq.) In respect to הֵפִיץ, *se diffundere*, comp. Ex. v. 12; 1 Sam. xiii. 8. [According to the E. V. the light is the subject of both members: "By what way is the light parted, which scattereth the east wind upon the earth." But this construction is less probable and suitable than that given above, which recognizes the "light" as the subject of the first member, and the "east-wind" of the second.—E.]

d. The rain-storm and the lightning considered as divinely appointed phenomena which, while they inspire terror, are productive of beneficent results: vers. 25–27.

Ver. 25. **Who hath divided a water-course for the rain-torrent,** *i. e.*, conducted the rain through the thick masses of clouds to specific portions of the thirsty earth. שֶׁטֶף, which of itself means "flood, torrent of waters" in general, is used here of a down-pouring beneficent torrent of rain [" the earthward direction assigned to the water-spouts is likened to an aqueduct coming downwards from the sky;" Delitzsch], and hence in a different sense from *e. g.*, Ps. xxxii. 6. The second member is taken verbally from chap xxviii. 26.

Ver. 26. **That it may rain on the land where no man is**; lit. "to cause it to rain," *etc.* The subject of לְהַמְטִיר is of course God who has been already indicated by מִי in ver. 25. That it should rain on a land of "no-man" (the construction as in ch. x. 22), *i. e.*, on a land destitute of men, not artificially irrigated and tilled by men, is here set forth as a wise and loving providential arrangement of God's. ["God lays stress on this circumstance in order to humiliate man, and to show him that the earth was made neither by him, nor for him." Renan. "Man who is so prone to put his own interests above everything else, and to judge everything from his own human point of view, is here most strikingly reminded, how much wider is the range of the Divine vision, and how God in the exercise of His loving solicitude remembers even those regions, which receive no care from man, so that even there the possibility of life and growth is secured to His creatures." Dillmann].

Ver. 27 then states more definitely this beneficent purpose of God: **to satisfy the wild and wilderness,** (שֹׁאָה וּמְשֹׁאָה as in ch. xxx. 3) [" the desert is thus like a thirsty pilgrim; it is parched, and thirsty, and sad, and it appeals to God, and He meets its wants and satisfies it," Barnes], **and to make the green herb to sprout**; lit. "to make the place (the place of going forth, מֹצָא, comp. ch. xxviii. 1) of the green herb to sprout."

5. *Continuation. c.* Questions respecting the phenomena of the atmosphere and the wonders of the starry heavens: vers. 28-38.

a. Respecting rain, dew, ice, and hoar-frost: vers. 28-30.

Vers. 28-29. **Is there a father to the rain?** As this member, together with the following inquires (through the formula מִי הוֹלִיד) after a *male* progenitor for the atmospheric precipitations of moisture, so does ver. 29 inquire after the mother of ice and hoar-frost, for the formula מִי יְלָדוֹ in *b* also refers to the agency of a mother, as well as the question in *a*. This variation of gender in the representation is to be explained by the fact that rain and dew come from heaven, the abode of God, while ice and hoar-frost come out of the earth, out of the secret womb of the waters (verse 8).—אֶגְלֵי טָל in ver. 28 *b* are not "reservoirs of dew" (Gesenius), for which the verb הוֹלִיד would not be suitable, but *drops* (lit. balls, globules; LXX.: *βῶλοι*) of dew, whether the root אגל be associated with גלל, *volvere* (which is the view commonly held), or with the Arab. agal, *retinere, colligere* (so Delitzsch).

Ver. 30 describes more specifically the wonderful process which takes place when water is frozen into ice **The water hardens like stone.** יִתְחַבָּאוּ, lit. "they hide themselves, draw themselves together, thicken" (a related form is חָמָא, whence חֶמְאָה, curdled milk). The same representation of the process of freezing as producing contraction or compression (a representation which in the strict physical sense is not quite correct, seeing that water on the contrary always expands in freezing—comp. Pfaff, in the work cited above, pp. 103, 189 seq.), was given above by Elihu, chapter xxxvii. 10, not however without indicating in what sense he intended this compression, a sense which is by no means incorrect; see on the passage. A similar intimation is conveyed here by the second member: **and the face of the deep cleaves together,** and thus constitutes a firm solid mass (*continuum*), instead of fluctuating to and fro, as in the fluid state. הִתְלַכֵּד as in ch. xli. 8 [17]; comp. the Greek *ἔχεσθαι*.

β. Respecting the control of the stars, and of their influence upon earth: vers. 31-33.

Ver. 31. **Canst thou bind the bands of the Pleiades?**—מַעֲדַנּוֹת here not = *amœnitates*, as in 1 Sam. xv. 32, [E. V., "sweet influences," referring to the softening and gladdening influences of spring-time, when that constellation makes its appearance] but *vincula* (LXX.: *δεσμόν*; Targ. שֵׁירֵי = *σειράς*) as appears from קשׁר "to bind," and the parallel מוֹשְׁכוֹת in *b*, and not less from the testimony of all the ancient versions, of Talmudic usage, and of the Masora. It is to be derived accordingly by transposition from ענד, "to bind" (comp. ch. xxxi. 36) not from עדן. The arranging of the stars of the Pleiades (כִּימָה as in ch. ix. 9) in a dense group is with poetic boldness described here as the binding of a fillet, or of a cluster of diamonds.

(See a similar conception copied out of Persian poets in Ideler, *Sternennamen*, p. 147).—**Or loose the bands of Orion**, so that this brilliant constellation would fall apart, or fall down from heaven, to which the presumptuous giant is chained (comp. on ch. ix. 9). The explanation preferred by Dillmann is admissible, and even perhaps, in view of the etymon of מוֹשְׁכוֹת, to be preferred to the one more commonly adopted: "Or canst thou loose the lines [German—*Zugseile*, draw-lines, traces, the cords by which he is *drawn* up to his place, suggested by מָשַׁךְ] of Orion (the giant suspended in heaven), and thus canst thou now raise, and now lower him in the firmament?" The reference of the passage to the Star Subêl = Canopus (Saad., Gekat., Abulwalid, comp. also Delitzsch) is uncertain, and conflicts with the well-known signification of כְּסִיל, which is also firmly established by ch. ix. 9.

Ver. 32. **Canst thou bring forth the bright stars in their time** (בְּעִתּוֹ as in ch. v. 26; Ps. civ. 27; cxlv. 15). The word מַזָּרוֹת, to which such a variety of interpretations have been given, which already the LXX. did not understand, and accordingly rendered by *μασουρώθ* [followed herein by E. V., "Mazzaroth"], seems to be most simply explained (with Dillmann) as a contracted form of מַזְהָרוֹת, from זהר, *splendere*, and to mean accordingly "the brightly shining, brilliant stars," in which case we may assume the planets to be intended, particularly such as are pre-eminently brilliant, as Venus, Jupiter, Mars, (comp. Vulg., "*Luciferum*") [Fürst: Jupiter, the supreme god of good fortune]. The "being brought forth *in their time*" seems to suit better these wandering stars than *e. g.*, "the two crowns," the Northern and Southern (Cocceius, Eichhorn, Michaelis, Ewald, by comparison with נזר) [these constellations being, as Dillmann objects, too obscure and too little known], or the twelve signs of the Zodiac (so the majority of moderns, on the basis of the very precarious identification of מַזָּרוֹת with מַזָּלוֹת, 2 Ki. xxiii. 5), or the twenty-eight stations (Arab. *menâzil*) of the moon (so A. Weber, in his *Abhandlung über die vedischen Nachrichten von den naxatra, oder Mondstationen*, 1860), or, finally, any prophetic stars whatever, *astra præsaga, præmonentia* (Gesenius, who refers the word to נזר in the Arabic signification).—**And guide the Bear** (lit., "the she-bear," עַיִשׁ, comp. ch. ix. 9) **together with his** [lit., her] **young?** *i. e.*, the constellation of the Bear with the three stars forming its tail, which are regarded as its children (בָּנִים, in Arab. בָּנוֹת); see on ch. ix. 9. The evening star (*vesperus*, Vulg.) is far from being intended, and equally so the comparatively unimportant constellation *Capella* (Eichhorn, *Bibliothek*, Vol. VII., p. 429).

Ver. 33. **Knowest thou the laws of heaven?** *i. e.*, the laws which rule the course of the stars, the succession of seasons and periods, annual and diurnal, *etc.*, (comp. Gen. i. 14 seq.; viii. 22).—**Or dost thou establish its dominion over the earth?** *i. e.*, dost thou ordain and confirm its influence (that of heaven, here personified as a king; comp. Ewald, § 318 *a*) on earthly destinies. מִשְׁטָר, "dominion," is construed [with בְּ] after the analogy of the verbs מָשַׁל בְּ, רָדָה בְּ.

γ. Respecting the Divine control of clouds and lightnings: vers. 34, 36. On ver. 34 *b*, comp. ch. xxii. 11 *b* (which is here verbally repeated). On ver. 35 comp. Ps. civ. 3; xxxiii. 9.

δ. Additional questions relating to the clouds, and their agencies: vers. 36-38.

Ver. 36. **Who put wisdom in the dark clouds, who gave understanding** to that which appears in the sky [Germ. "*Luftgebilde*," atmospheric phenomena]; *i. e.*, who has given to them an intelligent arrangement and significance. טֻחוֹת, from טוּחַ, signifies here as in Ps. li. 8, dark, hidden places," meaning here, as the connection shows, "dark clouds, black cloud-layers" (Eichhorn, Umbr., Hirz., Stickel, Hahn, Dillmann, *etc.*, by comparison with the Arabic טחא, and its derivative nouns. In that case שֶׂכְוִי, from the Hebr. and Aram. שׂכה, "to see," (comp. שְׂכִיּוֹת and מַשְׂכִּית), signifies "appearance, phenomenon, form," here according to the parallelism of the first member, "a form, phenomenon of the atmosphere, or the clouds." It can scarcely mean (the rainbow being certainly called קֶשֶׁת, Gen. ix. 13) "an appearance of light, fiery meteor" (Ewald, Hahn), or "the full moon," (so Dillmann, at least tentatively, assuming at the same time that טֻחוֹת refers to the dark phases of the moon). At all events the explanation which refers both parallel expressions to phenomena of the cloud-heavens *is the only one suited to the context* (as was the case with the meteorological sense of "gold" in chap. xxxvii. 22; whereas on the contrary the interpretation long ago adopted by the Vulg., the 2d Targ., and many Rabbis [and E. V.] and recently by Delitzsch [Gesenius, Noyes, Conant, Barnes, Wordsworth, Schlottmann, Renan], according to which טֻחוֹת means "the reins," or "entrails," (comp. Ps. li. 8 [6]), and שֶׂכְוִי the "cock" [as "the weather-prophet κατ' ἐξοχήν among animals," Delitzsch: while Gesenius, Schlottmann, Noyes, Conant, Wordsworth, Renan, as also E. V., render by "heart, intelligence"] yields a meaning that is singular enough, and which is made no better when the cock is regarded as *speculator et præco auroræ*, as *ales diei nuntius* (Prudentius), or as a weather-prophet (after Cicero, *de divin.* II., 26), and the reins are supposed to be mentioned because of their power of foretelling the weather and presaging the future. Still more singular and opposed to the context is the rendering of the LXX.: *Τίς ἔδωκεν γυναικὶ ὑφάσματος σοφίαν καὶ ποικιλτικὴν ἐπιστήμην* [And who has given to woman skill in weaving, or knowledge of embroidery]? They seem to have read in the first member טוֹוֹת, in the second שְׂכָוֹת, "embroidering women," or שַׂכּוֹת, "to embroider."

Ver. 37. **Who numbers the clouds in wisdom.**—סִפֵּר as elsewhere the Kal: "to number" (chap. xxviii. 27). **And the bottles of the heavens—who inclines them**—*i. e.*, who causes them to be emptied, to pour out their fluid contents. The comparison of the clouds, laden with rain, to bottles, or pitchers occurs frequently also in Arabic poets (see Schultens on the passage). [E. V. "Who can *stay* the bottles of heaven?" which is less suitable to הִשְׁכִּיב, and to the context. Jerome, taking נִבְלֵי to mean "harps," renders uniquely: *et concentrum cœlorum quis dormire faciet?*]

Ver. 38. **When the dust flows together into a molten mass.** מוּצָק, "fused, solid metal," a word which is to be explained in accordance with ch. xxxvii. 18 (not in accordance with ch. xxii. 16). צֶקֶת here, as in 1 Kings xxii. 35, to be rendered intransitively: "When the dust pours itself," *i. e.*, when it flows, runs, as it were, together. In respect to רְגָבִים, "clods," comp. ch. xxi. 33.

6. *Continuation and conclusion. d.* Questions respecting the propagation and preservation of wild beasts as objects of the creative power and wise providence of God. Chap. xxxviii—xxxix. 30. *a.* The lion, the raven, the wild goat, the stag, and the wild ass: chap. xxxviii. 39—xxxix. 8.

Ver. 39. **Dost thou hunt the prey for the lioness, and dost thou appease the craving of the young lions?**—Respecting the lion's names, לָבִיא and כְּפִיר, comp. on ch. iv. 11. "To appease (lit. to fill) the craving" (מִלֵּא חַיָּה), means the same as "to fill the soul" (מִלֵּא נֶפֶשׁ), Prov. vi. 30.

Ver. 40. **When they crouch in the dens.** On יָשֹׁחוּ comp. Ps. x. 10. On מְעוֹנוֹת *lustra*, comp. Ps. civ. 22. In respect to סֻכָּה in *b*, comp. סֹךְ, used elsewhere in the sense of "thicket," Ps. x. 9; Jer. xxv. 38. On לְמוֹ־אָרֶב, which gives the object of the "crouching" and "sitting" [or "dwelling"], comp. xxxi. 9 *b*.

Ver. 41. **Who provides for the raven its prey, when its young ones cry unto God, [wander without food?**—The interrogation properly extends over the whole verse, not, as in E. V., over the first member only, which makes the remainder of the verse meaningless.—E.]. הֵכִין, "to prepare, to provide," as in ch. xxvii. 16 seq. כִּי "when," as in ver. 40 *a*. The ravens are introduced here, as in the parallel passages, Ps. cxlvii. 9; Luke xii. 24, as objects of God's fatherly care, rather than any other description of birds, because they are specially noticeable among birds in search of food, by reason of their hoarse cries. Observe moreover the contrast, which is surely intentional between the mighty monarch of the beasts, which in ver. 39 seq. is put at the head of beasts in search of food, and the contemptibly small, insignificant, and uncomely raven. ["Jewish and Arabian writers tell strange stories of this bird, and its cruelty to its young; hence, say some, the Lord's express care for the young ravens, after they had been driven out of the nests by the parent birds; but this belief in the ravens' want of affection to its young is entirely without foundation. To the fact of the raven being a common bird in Palestine, and to its habit of flying restlessly about in constant search for food to satisfy its voracious appetite, may perhaps be traced the reason for its being selected by our Lord and the inspired writers as the especial object of God's providing care." Smith's Bib. Dict. Art. "Raven."]

Chap. xxxix. 1-4: Propagation and increase of the wild goats (rock-goats, ibices) and stags.

Ver. 1. **Knowest thou the time when the wild goats bear? observest thou the travail of the hinds?**—חֹלֵל Inf. Pilel of חוּל, "to be in labor," ὠδίνειν (comp. the Pulal in ch. xv. 7), here the object of תִּשְׁמֹר, to which verb the influence of the הֲ before יָדַעְתָּ in the first member extends.

Ver. 2. **Dost thou number the months which they** (must) **fulfil**; *i. e.*, until they bring forth, hence their period of gestation. [The point of the question can scarcely be that Job could have no knowledge whatever of the matters here referred to, but that he could have no such knowledge as would qualify him to stand toward these creatures at such a time in the place of God; or, as Carey expresses it: "Can you keep an exact register of all this, and exercise such providential care over these creatures, the mountain goats and hinds, as to preserve them from dangers during the time of gestation, and then deliver them at the proper period?"—E.]. In the second member לְדְתָּנָה, with full-toned suffix, is used for לִדְתָּן; comp. Ruth i. 19, and Gesenius, § 91 [§ 89], 1, Rem. 2. [Green, § 104, *g*].

Ver. 3. **They bow themselves** (comp. 1 Sam. iv. 19), **they let their young ones break through** (lit. "cleave;" comp. ch. xvi. 13), **they cast away their pains**; *i. e.*, the fruit of their pains, their *fœtus*, for this is what חֲבָלִים here signifies, not the after-pains, as Hirzel and Schlottmann think. Comp. ῥίψαι ὠδῖνα = *edere fœtum*, in Euripides, *Ion* 45; also examples of the same phraseology from the Arabic in Schultens on the passage. It will be seen further that תפלחנה (instead of which Olshausen needlessly conjectures תפלטנה after chap. xxi. 10) forms a paronomasia with תשלחנה.

Ver. 4. **Their young ones become strong** (חלם, lit. "to grow fat," *pinguescere*), **grow up in the desert**.—בַּבָּר=בַּחוּץ, or בַּשָּׂדֶה, as often in the Targ. [a meaning more suitable to the context than that of E. V. "with corn"]. **They go away, and return not to them**; *i. e.*, to the parents. לָמוֹ however might also be explained after ch. vi. 19; xxiv. 16 as *Dat. commodi: sibi=sui juris esse volentes* (Schultens, Delitzsch).

Vers. 5-8. The wild ass, introduced as an example of many beasts, the life of which is cha-

racterized by unrestricted liberty, defying and mocking all human control and nurture.

Ver. 5. **Who hath sent out the wild ass free, and who hath loosed the bands of the fugitive?**—The words פֶּרֶא (Arab, ferâ; comp. above ch. vi. 5; xi. 12; xxiv. 5) and עָרוֹד denote one and the same animal, the wild ass or onager (the ὄνος ἄγριος of the LXX., the "Kulan" of the eastern Asiatics of to-day), which is characterized by the first name as the "swift runner," by the latter (which in Aramaic, and particularly in the Targum is the common name), as the "shy, fleeing one." As to the predicate accusative חָפְשִׁי, "free, set loose," comp. Deut. xv. 12; Jer. xxxiv. 14. As to the second member, comp. ch. xxxviii. 31.

Ver. 6. **Whose home** [lit. "house"] **I have made the desert, and his abode the salt-steppe.**—The word "salt-steppe" (מְלֵחָה) which is here used as parallel to "waste, desert" (עֲרָבָה, ch. xxiv. 5 *b*), stands in Ps. cvii. 34 as the opposite of אֶרֶץ פְּרִי (comp. Judg. ix. 45, where mention is made of sowing a destroyed city with salt). On the preference of the wild ass for saline plants, and on his disposition to take up his abode in salt marshes, comp. Oken, *Allg. Naturgesch.* Vol. VII., p. 1230.

Ver. 7. [**He laughs at the tumult** (E. V. "multitude," but the parallelism favors "tumult") **of the city**], **the driver's shouts he hears not**; *i. e.*, he flees from the control of the drivers, to which the tamed ass is subjected. On תְּשֻׁאוֹת, comp. ch. xxxvi. 29.

Ver. 8. **He ranges through the mountains as his pasture.**—So according to the reading יָתוּר (Imperf. of תּוּר, *investigare*), which is attested by almost all the ancient versions, by the LXX, Vulg., Targum. The Masoretic reading יְתוּר is either (with the Pesh. Le Clerc, *etc.*) to be taken as a variant of יֶתֶר, *abundantia*, or as a derivative of תּוּר, with the meaning, "that which is searched out" (*investigatum, investigabile*). But the statement that "the abundance of the mountains is the pasture of the wild ass" would be at variance with the fact in respect to the life of these animals, which inhabit the bare mountain-steppes (comp. Oken in the work cited above). On the other hand we should expect the normal form יְתוּר, following the analogy of such words as יְקוּם to have an active rather than a passive signification. יְתוּר however can scarcely mean "circle, compass," [E. V. "range"] here (Hahn).

β. The oryx and ostrich: vers. 9-18.

Ver. 9. **Will the oryx be pleased to serve thee?**—רֵים, contracted from רְאֵם (comp. the full written form רְאֵים, Ps. xcii. 11), assuredly denotes not the rhinoceros (Aq., Vulgate) [Good, Barnes], because the animal intended must be one that was common in Western Asia, and especially in the regions of Syria and Palestine. Comp. the reference to it in Ps. xxii. 22 [21]; xxix. 6; Deut. xxxiii. 17; Isa. xxxiv. 7. It would be more natural, with Schultens, Gesenius, De Wette, Umbreit, Hirzel [Robinson, Noyes, Carey, Wordsworth, Renan, Rodwell, Conant, Fürst, SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.* Art. "Unicorn"], *etc.*, to understand the buffalo or wild ox [*bos bubalus*) to be intended, seeing that this animal is still quite common in Palestine, and that here a contrast seems to be intended between this wild ox and the tame species (see ver. 10). But this particular buffalo of Palestine is an animal which is not particularly strong, or characterized by untamable wildness, as is shown by the fact that it is frequently used in tilling the land (RUSSELL, *Naturgesch. von Aleppo*, II. 7) [THOMSON'S *Land and the Book*, I. 386, 387]. The μονοκέρως of the LXX. [E. V.: "unicorn"] (of which the Talmudic קרש is a mutilated form, and the ῥινοκέρως of Aquila and Jerome is a misunderstanding) points to an animal which is, if not always, yet often, represented as having one horn, *i. e.*, as being armed with *one* horn on the forehead, consisting of two which have grown together. Such an animal seems in ancient times to have been somewhat common in Egypt and South-western Asia, the same being a species nearly related to the oryx—antelope (*Antil. loucoryx*) of to-day. It is represented on Egyptian monuments, now with two horns, and now with one. It is described by Aristotle and Pliny as a one-horned, cloven hoof (Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* II. 1; *De Partib. Anim.* III. 2; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* XI. 106); and in all probability it has been again discovered recently in the *Tschiru*, or the *Antil. Hodgsonii* of Southern Thibet (Huc and Gabet, *Journeyings through Mongolia and Thibet*, Germ. Edit., p. 323; see the passage quoted in Delitzsch, II., p. 334, *n.* 2). The name רים in the passage before us is all the more suitably applied to such an animal of the oryx species, in view of the fact that the corresponding Arabic word still signifies a species of antelope among the Syro-Arabians of to-day, and that this same oryx-family embraces sub-species which are particularly wild, largely and powerfully built, and almost bovine in their characteristics. Accordingly, Luther's translation of the word by "unicorn," in this passage, and probably in every other where ראם occurs in the Old Testament, supported as it is by the LXX., might be justified without our being compelled to understand by this "unicorn" a fabulous animal like that of the Perso-Assyrian monuments, or of the English royal coat-of-arms. Comp. on the subject S. Bochart, *Hierozoicon*, II. 335 seq.; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Alterth.* IV. 2, 288 seq.; Lichtenstein, *Die Antilopen*, 1824; Lewysohn, *Zoologie des Talmud*, 1858, § 146, 174; Sundewall, *Die Thierarten des Aristoteles*, Stockholm, 1863, p. 64 seq.; also Koner's *Zeitschr. für allgem. Erdkunde*, 1862, II., H. 3, p. 227, where interesting information is given respecting the researches of the Englishman, W. B. Bailie, touching the existence of a one-horned animal still to be found in the regions of Central Africa, south of the Sea of Tsad, differing both from the rhinoceros and from the unicorn of the British coat-of-arms, which is probably, therefore, an African variety of the oryx—antelope, and possibly the very same variety as that represented on the old Egyptian monuments. [See Robinson's *Researches in Palestine*, III. 306, 563; Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*,

II., p. 167 seq.; and the remarks of Dr. Mason, of the Assam Mission, in the *Christian Review*, January, 1856, quoted by Conant in this verse.] **Will he lodge** [lit. "pass the night," יָלִין] **at thy crib?**—lit. "over thy crib" [hence אֵבוּס cannot be, as defined by Gesenius, "stall, stable"], for the crib being very low, the cattle of the ancients in the East reached over it with the head while lying beside it. Comp. Isa. i. 3 and Hitzig on the passage.

Ver. 10. **Dost thou bind the oryx to the furrow of his cord?**—*i. e.*, to the furrow (comp. chap. xxxi. 38) which he raises by means of the ploughshare, as he is led along by the cord. **Or will he harrow the valleys** (Ps. lxv. 14) **after thee** (אַחֲרֶיךָ), *i. e.*, while following thee, when thou seekest to lead him in the act of ploughing [rather, as in the text, harrowing, שַׂדֵּד, to level].

Ver. 11. **Wilt thou trust him because his strength is great?**—*i. e.*, will the great strength which he possesses awake thy confidence, and not rather thy mistrust? On יְגִיעַ, "labor" ["wilt thou commit to him thy labor"], in the sense of the fruit of labor, the product of tilling, comp. Ps. lxxviii. 46: cxxviii. 2. The verse following is decisive in favor of this interpretation of the verse before us; otherwise the word might, in accordance with Gen. xxxi. 42, denote the labor or the toil itself.

Ver. 12. **Wilt thou trust to him that he bring home thy sowing?**—Respecting כִּי as exponent of the object, see Ewald, § 336, *b*. יָשׁוּב, if we adhere to it, with the K'thibh, is used in the transitive sense, as in chap. xlii. 10; Ps. lxxxv. 5. The K'ri, however, substitutes for it the Hiphil, which, in this sense, is the form more commonly used. **And that he gather (into) thy threshing-floor.**—גָּרְנְךָ is probably locative (=בְּגָרְנְךָ). It may possibly, however, be taken as accusative of the object *per synecdochen continentis pro contento* (threshing-floor= fruits of the threshing-floor, yield of the harvest), as in Ruth iii. 2; Matt. iii. 12.

Vers. 13–18. The ostrich (lit. the female ostrich) introduced as an example of untamable wildness from among the birds. **The wing of the** (female) **ostrich waves joyously.**—רְנָנִים, lit. "wailings, shrill cries of mourning" *plur. abstr.*) is a poetic designation of the ostrich here, or of the female ostrich, noted for its piercing cries. So correctly the Vulg., Bochart, and almost all the moderns. The Targ. arbitrarily understands the bird designated to be the "mountain-cock," Kimchi and Luther the "peacock" [and so E. V.: "Gavest thou the goodly wings unto the pea-cocks?"] As to נֶעֱלָס, "to move itself joyously," comp. chap. xx. 18; also the Homeric expression, ἀγάλλεσθαι πτερύγεσσιν. **Is it a pious pinion and plumage?**—*i. e.*, is the wing of this bird, the waving of which is so powerful and wonderfully rapid, a pious one, productive of mild and tender qualities, like that of the stork? For it is to that bird—which in its build resembles the ostrich, but which is more mild in disposition, and is, in particular, more affectionate and careful in the treatment of its offspring—that the predicate חֲסִידָה, *pia*, with its double meaning, refers (which Delitzsch accordingly translates *storchfromm* [stork-pious], *pia instar ciconiæ*). This is evident from the description which follows.

Ver. 14. **Nay, she abandons her eggs to the earth.**—כִּי here "nay, rather," as in chap. xxii. 2. The subj. of תַעֲזֹב is the רְנָנִים of ver. 13, construed here as Fem. Sing. The same construction obtains in the following verbs (Ew. § 318 *a*).

Ver. 15. **And forgets that the foot can crush them.**—וַתִּשְׁכַּח, simply consecutive, and hence present; comp. chap. iii. 21. On the sing. suffix in תְּזוּרֶהָ, referring to the eggs, see Gesenius, § 146 [§ 143], 3. The fact here described, to wit, that the mother ostrich easily forgets her eggs, at least while she is not yet through with laying them, as well as in the beginning of the period of incubation, and that she leaves them unprotected, especially on the approach of hunters, is true of this animal only in its wild condition. In that state it shares these and similar habits, proceeding from excessive wildness and fear of man, with many other birds, as, *e.g.*, the partridge. In its tamed condition, the ostrich watches over its young very diligently indeed,—and, moreover, shows nothing of that stupidity popularly ascribed to it, and which has become proverbial (to which ver. 17 alludes). Comp. the Essay entitled: *Die Zuchtung des Straussen als europäisches Hausthier*, in the *Ausland*, 1869, No. 13, p. 306. The opinion moreover, partially circulated among the ancients, that the ostrich does not at all incubate its eggs, belongs to that class of scientific fables which, as in the case of those strange animals the basilisk, the dragon, the unicorn, *etc.*, have been incorrectly imputed to the Old Testament. The verse before us furnishes no support whatever to that opinion. [See Smith's Bib. Dict., Art. "Ostrich." "The habit of the ostrich leaving its eggs to be matured by the sun's heat is usually appealed to in order to confirm the Scriptural account, 'she leaveth her eggs to the earth;' but this is probably the case only with the tropical birds; the ostriches with which the Jews were acquainted were, it is likely, birds of Syria, Egypt and North Africa; but even if they were acquainted with the habits of the tropical ostriches, how can it be said that 'she forgetteth that the foot may crush' the eggs, when they are covered a foot deep or more in sand? We believe the true explanation of this passage is to be found in the fact that the ostrich deposits some of her eggs not in the nest, but around it; these lie about on the surface of the sand, to all appearance forsaken; they are however designed for the nourishment of the young birds, according to Levaillant and Bonjainville (Cuvier, *An. King.* by Griffiths and others, viii. 432)," and see below on ver. 16].

Ver. 16. **She deals hardly with her young, as though they were not hers**; lit. "for not to her" (*i. e.*, belonging to her) הִקְשִׁיחַ, lit. "*he* deals hardly;" which, bearing in

mind [the suffix in בָּנֶיהָ, and] the clause לְלֹא־לָהּ, which immediately follows, gives a change of gender which is intolerably harsh, which we may perhaps obviate (with Ewald, *etc.*) by pointing הַקְשֵׁיחַ (Inf. Absol., comp Ewald, § 280, *a*). The correction תַּקְשִׁיחַ (Hirzel, Dillmann) [Merx] is less plausible. **In vain is her labor without her being distressed**; lit. "without fear" (בְּלִי־פַחַד), *i. e.*, her labor in laying her eggs is in vain (inasmuch as many of her eggs are abandoned by her to destruction), without her giving herself any trouble or anxiety on that account. This unconcern and carelessness of the female ostrich touching the fate of her young, which stands in glaring contrast with the tender anxiety of the stork-mother (ver. 13 *b*), is carried to such a length, that she herself often stamps to pieces her eggs (the shells of which moreover are quite hard), when she observes that men or beasts have been about; and even uses the eggs which are left to lie unhatched in feeding the young ones as they creep forth. Comp. Wetzstein, in Delitzsch II., p. 339 seq.

Ver. 17. **For God made her to forget wisdom, and gave her no share in understanding.**—הִשָּׁהּ Perf. Hiph. with the suffix ־הּ from נשה (comp. ch. xi. 6). חָלַק בְּבִינָה, "to give a share in understanding" (comp. ch. vii. 13; xxi. 25). For parallel expressions as to the thought, to wit, Arabic proverbs about the stupidity of the ostrich, see Schultens and Umbreit on the passage. The only other passage in the Old Testament where the cruelty of the ostrich is set forth in proverbial form is Lam. iv. 3.

Ver. 18. **At the time when she lashes herself aloft, she laughs at the horse and his rider.**—כָּעֵת, here not "at this time, just now" (Gesen., Schlott,), but=כָּעֵת אֲשֶׁר, and hence with an elliptical relative clause following. Respecting מרא, which both in Kal. and Hiphil can signify "to lash, to beat," and which in Hebrew is found in this signification only here, see Gesenius in the Lexicon. The whole verse describes in a way which combines simplicity and terseness with vividness, the lightning-like swiftness of an ostrich, or a herd of such birds, fleeing before hunters on horseback, the running movement of the bird being aided by the vibration of the wings. At the same time the mention of "the horse and his rider" prepares the transition to the description which follows, the only one in this series which refers to a tamed animal.

Vers. 19-25. The war-horse—a favorite subject of description also on the part of Arabian and other oriental poets; comp. the "Praise of the Horse" in v. Hammer—Purgstall's *Duftkörner:* Amrul-Keis, *Moallakat*, vers. 50,64, and other parallels to this passage cited by Umbreit. Of all these poetic descriptions which have come down from antiquity (to which also may be added Virgil, *Georg.* III , 75 seq.)., the present one is the oldest and most beautiful. ["In connection with this description of the war-horse, which among many similar ones is the most splendid, it has been justly observed that to a Hebrew the horse as a theme of description must seem all the more noble in that he was known not as a beast of draught, but only as a war-horse." Schlottmann].

Ver. 19. **Dost thou give strength** (גְּבוּרָה used specially of warlike strength, *fortitudo;* comp. Judg. viii. 21; 2 Kings xviii. 20) **dost thou clothe his neck with fluttering hair?** *i. e.*, with quivering, waving mane? It is thus that most moderns explain the word רַעְמָה, not found elsewhere, from the root רעם, "to quake" (Ezek. xxvii. 35), by comparison with the Greek φόβη (related to φόβος). The signification "thunder, neighing" (Symmach., Theodot., Jerome, Luther, Schlottmann) [E. V.] would indeed be etymologically admissible, but it would not be suited to the words "neck," and "clothe." Umbreit and Ewald, (§ 113, *d*) [the latter however in his Commentary as above—"quivering mane"] explain it by "dignity;" but the identity of רעמה with רְאֵמָה is questionable, and such words as גָּאוֹן, or שְׂאֵת would have been more naturally used to express that idea.

Ver. 20. **Dost thou make him leap like the locust?**—*i. e.*, when he rushes along on the gallop, like a vastly enlarged bounding troop of locusts (comp. Joel ii. 4). "What is intended is a spiral motion in leaps, now to the right, now to the left, which is called the caracol, a word used in horsemanship, borrowed from the Arabic *har-gala-l-farasu* (comp. חַרְגֹּל), through the medium of the Moorish Spanish" (Delitzsch). [The rendering of E. V.: "canst thou make him *afraid* as a grasshopper"—is at variance with the spirit of the description, which, in each member, sets forth some trait which commands admiration.—E.]. **The glory of his snorting is a terror,**—or, "since the glory of his snorting," *etc.* (descriptive clause without וְ). On נחר "snorting," comp. the Arabic *nachir*, "the death-rattle, snoring," Greek, φρύαγμα, Lat., *fremitus*. הוד here denoting not a splendid appearance, but a majestic peal or roar.

Ver. 21. **They explore in the valley, then he rejoiceth in strength.**—The subject of יַחְפְּרוּ can scarcely be the *hoofs* of the horse (Delitzsch ["the representation of the many pawing hoofs being blended with that of the pawing horse"]), and the use throughout thus far of the singular in speaking of the horse (so also again in יָשִׂישׂ) makes it impossible that the plural here should refer to him. Hence the signification "pawing" preferred here by the ancient versions [and E. V.], and most of the moderns seems inadmissible, even admitting that חפר is the word commonly used for the pawing of the horse (see Schultens on the passage). We must rather with Cocceius and Ewald understand the subject to be the riders, or the warriors; "they take observations," or "observations are taken in the valley (while it is uncertain whether the fighting should begin): then he rejoiceth in strength." The meaning "to paw" is to be retained only in case we adopt

with Dillmann [Merx] the reading יְחְפֹּר, or with Böttcher יַחְפִּרֵר. **He goes forth against an armed host**, lit. "the armor;" נֶשֶׁק here otherwise than in ch. xx. 24.—On ver. 22 comp. vers. 7 and 18.

Ver. 23. **The quiver rattleth upon him**; *i. e.* the quiver of the horseman who is seated upon him, not the hostile contents of the quiver, the whirring arrows of the enemy, as Schultens [Conant, Rodwell] explain. Besides this part of the armor, the second member mentions the "spear and the lance" [not "shield," E. V.], or rather with poetic circumlocution, "the lightning (lit. flame) of the spear and the lance," להב synonymous with בָּרָק, ch. xx. 25; comp. להט, Gen. iii. 24; also Judg. iii. 22; 1 Sam. xvii. 7; Nah. iii 3.

Ver 24. **With rushing and raging he swallows the ground**; *i. e.* in sweeping over the ground at full gallop, he swallows it up as it were; a figure which is current also among Arabic poets (see Schultens and Delitzsch on the passage). The assonance of רגז־רעש may be represented by "rushing and raging."—**And he does not stand still when the trumpet sounds.**—Lit. "he does not show himself fixed, does not stay fixed, does not contain himself:" יַאֲמִין accordingly in its primitive sensuous meaning; not "he believes not" (Kimchi, Aben Ezra) [E. V. *i. e.* for joy; it is too good to be true]. As to קול comp. Ewald, § 286, *f* [adverbial use of קול here=when the trumpet is loud]. As parallel in thought comp. beyond all other passages that of Virgil referred to above (Georg. III. 83 seq.):

> . . . . *Tum, si qua sonum procul arma dedere,*
> *Stare loco nescit, micat auribus et tremit artus*
> *Collectumque fremens volvit sub naribus ignem.*

Ver. 25. **As often as the trumpet** (sounds). **he says, Aha!** *i. e.*, he neighs, full of a joyous eagerness for the battle. On בְּדֵי *quotiescunque* (lit. "in sufficiency"), comp. Ewald, § 337, *c.*—**And from afar he smells the battle, the thunder** (comp. ch. xxxvi. 29) **of the captains, and the shouting** (the battle-cries of the contestants; comp. Judg. vii. 18 seq.). Similarly Pliny, *N. H.* VIII. 42: *præsagiunt pugnam:* and of moderns more particularly Layard (*New Discoveries*, p. 330): "Although docile as a lamb, and requiring no other guide than the halter, when the Arab mare hears the war-cry of the tribe, and sees the quivering spear of her rider, her eyes glitter with fire, her blood-red nostrils open wide, her neck is nobly arched, and her tail and mane are raised and spread out to the wind," *etc.*

Ver. 26. The hawk, as the first example of birds of prey, distinguished by their strength, lightning-like swiftness, and lofty flight.—**Doth the hawk fly upward by thy understanding?**—נֵץ (the "high flyer") is, according to the unanimous testimony of the ancient versions, the hawk, a significant bird, as is well known. in the Egyptian hieroglyphics, which is here introduced on account of its mysteriously noteworthy characteristic of taking its flight southwards at the approach of winter (Pliny, *N. H.* x. 8). For it is to this that the apocop. Imperf. Hiph. יַאֲבֶר (denominative from אֶבְרָה, "wing") refers: *assurgit, attollitur alis*, not to the yearly moulting, which precedes the migration southward (Vulg.: *plumescit;* in like manner the Targ., Gregory the Great, Rosenm.). For this annual renewal of plumage (πτεροφυεῖν, see LXX., Is. xl. 31) is common to all birds, and is predicated elsewhere in the Old Testament only of the eagle (Ps. ciii. 5; Mic. i. 16; Is. xl. 31), not of the hawk.

Vers. 27–30. The *eagle*, as king of the birds, closing the series of native animals here described, in like manner as the lion, as king of the mammalia, had opened the series. נֶשֶׁר is in the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament, like ἀετός in the New Testament (comp. Matt. xxiv. 28; Luke xvii. 37), a common designation of the eagle proper, and of the vulture: and the characteristic of carnivorousness which is here and often elsewhere referred to belongs in fact not only to the varieties of the vulture (such as the carrion-kite and lammergeyer), but also to the more common varieties of the eagle, such as the golden eagle and the osprey, which do not disdain to eat the carcasses of animals which have recently died. Comp. Winer's *Real-Wörter-Buch*, under *Adler.*—**Doth the eagle soar at thy command?** lit. make high (יגביה, scil. עוף) his flight; comp. ch. v. 7.—**And build his nest on high?** lit. "is it at thy command that he builds his nest on high?" Comp. Obad. 4; Jer. xlix. 16; Prov. xxx. 19.

Ver. 28. With the phrase שֶׁן־סֶלַע, lit. "tooth of the rock" comp. the names *Dent du midi*, *Dent-blanche*, *Dent de Moreles*, *etc.*

Ver. 30. **And his young ones lap up blood.**—[The gender throughout is masculine, not fem. as in E. V.] יְעַלְעוּ from עלע, an abbreviated secondary form of עִלְעֵל, Pilp. of עול, "to suck." Possibly, however, we should read (with Gesen. and Olsh.) יְלַעְלְעוּ, from לעע =לוע, *deglutere.* On the sucking of blood by the young eagles, comp. *Ælian. H. anim.* x. 14: *σαρκῶν ἥδεται βορᾷ καὶ πίνει αἷμα καὶ τὰ νεόττια ἐκτρέφει τοῖς αὐτοῖς.*

7. *Conclusion of the discourse, together with Job's answer:* ch. xl. 1-5.

Ver. 2. **Will the censurer contend with the Almighty?** to wit, after all that has here been laid before him in proof of the greatness and wonderful power of God. Observe the return to ch. xxxviii. 2, which this question brings about. רב Inf. absol. of רִיב (as in Judg. xi. 25) here in the sense of a future. The adoption of this construction in preference to the finite verb gives a meaning that is particularly forcible. Comp. the well-known sentence: *mene incepto desistere victum?* Also Ewald, § 328, *a.*—**He who hath reproved God, let him answer it**; *i. e.* let him reply to all the questions asked from ch. xxxviii. 2 on.

Ver. 4. **Behold, I am too base**; *i. e.* to

solve the problem presented, I am not equal to it.—**I lay my hand on my mouth**; *i. e.* I impose on myself absolute silence; comp. ch. xxi. 5; xxix. 9.

Ver. 5. **Once have I spoken, and I will not again begin,** will no more undertake to speak; see on ch. iii. 2. "Once—twice," as in Ps. lxii. 12 [11], are used only because of the poetic parallelism for "often;" comp. Gesenius, § 120 [§ 118], 5. The solemn formal retractation which Job here makes of his former presumptuous challenges of God marks the first stage of his gradual return to a more becoming position toward God. It is God's purpose, however, to lead him forward from this first stage, consisting in true self-humiliation (in contrast to his former self-exaltation) to a still more advanced stage—even the complete melting down of his heart in sincere penitence. It is the realization of this purpose which Jehovah seeks in His second and last discourse.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. As a magnificent specimen of physico-theological demonstration in poetic form, the present discourse of God, the first and longest which He delivers, is incomparable. With wonderful symmetry of treatment, it makes first the inanimate, and then the animate creation the theme of profound contemplation; each of these domains being treated with about the same fulness, and with a homologous arrangement of strophes (see Exegetical Remarks, No. 1), in order thus to impress Job with the highest admiration of the divine power, wisdom and goodness, as these attributes are revealed in the entire world of nature. The First Long Strophe (ch. xxxviii. 4–15) which makes the creation of the heavens, the earth, and the sea, the theme of contemplation serves to illustrate principally the divine *omnipotence*, together with the attributes most immediately related to it, eternity, infinity and omnipresence, or the divine being as transcending space and time. Towards the close of this strophe the attribute of *justice* is also drawn into the circle of contemplation, it being one chief object of the whole description to represent the Almighty God as being also just in His vast activities, always and everywhere just (see vers. 13-15). The consideration of omnipotence is next followed by that of *wisdom*, together with the attribute of omniscience which stands most closely connected with it, the discussion having reference to the hidden heights and depths above and below the earth, from which the phenomena of the atmosphere and of light proceed (Second Long Strophe, ch. xxxviii. 16 seq.). Already toward the end of this description the attribute of God's *goodness* emerges into view, as it is shown in the beneficent effects of the rain-showers (vers. 25-27). Afterwards in the third Long Strophe (vers. 28-38) this attribute retires again to the background, while the power manifested in the heavens, and the wisdom revealed in the atmosphere, occupy the foreground. All the more decidedly however in the last three Long Strophes, or in the zoological and biological description constituting the section which we have marked *d* (ch. xxxviii. 39—xxxix. 30), is the discourse again directed to the goodness of God, or to the Creator's fatherly care, which is most intimately united with His power and wisdom, and which in the exercise of them takes the most particular interest in the life of His earthly animate creation. For all that is advanced in this section in the way of proof of the wonderful wisdom and all-penetrative knowledge of the Most High in the sphere of animal life, and of its ordinary as well as its extraordinary phenomena is subordinated to the teleological reference to His special providence, in view of which not one of His creatures is indifferent to Him. (Comp. Bochart's Remarks on ch. xxxix. 1-4: The knowledge here spoken of is not passive and speculative simply, but that knowledge which belongs to God, by which He not only knows all things, but directs and governs them, *etc.*). That which makes this survey of the most exalted attributes of God as reflected in the wonders of His creation especially impressive is the accumulation of so many examples and illustrations from the domain of physical theology, and the wonderful art with which they are elaborated in the minutest detail, together with the striking harmony and consistency which their arrangement exhibits, notwithstanding all the flow and freedom of the poetic sweep of thought. Not one of these illustrations from the great book of creation is absolutely new. Job himself has more than once in his discourses introduced brief reflective descriptions of nature similar in kind, and scarcely inferior in beauty (ix. 4-10; xii. 7-10, 12-25; xxvi. 5-14); even Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar have at least occasionally described, not without skill and taste, the divine power and wisdom, as they are revealed in the works of His creation; and Elihu near the close of his discourses dwelt on this theme at length, and with powerful effect. The grandeur and superiority of that which Jehovah here advances, in part confirming, in part going beyond those utterances of the former speakers, consists in the way in which, alike with artless simplicity, and with harmonious and connected order, He has accumulated such an array of the most manifold and luminous evidences of His majesty as revealed in the wonders of nature. Comp. Julius Fürst, *Geschichte der biblischen Literatur, etc.*, II., p. 418: "The poet has here artistically combined the utmost polish of diction, the greatest abundance of natural pictures, the most thrilling and winning vividness in the succinct descriptions given of the wonders of creation; and the effect on Job must have been really overpowering. The reader also finds the discourse distinguished by tone and harmony, by power, acuteness, and clearness, by method, order, and plan, so that it presents itself as the most beautiful discourse in the Old Testament Scriptures. In this discourse, cast in the form of questions, Jehovah exhibits the animate and inanimate creation, the manifold channels in which the forces of nature secretly operate, its wonderful and mysterious phenomena, as they are held together in glorious order by His creative hand, as they are ruled by His nod. The eternal creative energy, which bears witness to a wisdom that is unsearchable, to a providential love, to a wise moral order of the universe, appears to the weak human spirit

as an insoluble mystery, which has for its aim to put Job to shame. In this discourse, embracing six long strophes, each consisting for the most part of twelve verse-lines, the exhibition of the transcendent wonders of nature certainly imparts indescribable power to the contemplation of the greatness of the Creator. Every one must see however that these natural wonders, after we have explained them in their immediate foundations through our knowledge of natural laws, and after we have understood them from the general laws of nature, must be understood according to the effects which they produce. The next thing to be noticed is the poetic conception of the beauty of nature, the deep mental contemplation of the Cosmos, as it shows itself among all the civilized nations of antiquity; and then the poetry of nature found among the Hebrews, considered particularly as the reflex of monotheism. The characteristic marks of the Hebrew poetry of nature, as A. Von Humboldt strikingly observes in his Cosmos, are that "it always embraces the whole universe in its unity, comprising both terrestrial life and the luminous realms of space. It dwells but rarely on the individuality of phenomena, preferring the contemplation of great masses. The Hebrew poet does not depict nature as a self-dependent object, glorious in its individual beauty, but always as in relation and subjection to a higher spiritual power. The natural wonders here sung by the poet point to the invariableness, the amazing regularity of the operations of nature, *i. e.*, to its laws, which lead us to adore supreme wisdom, power, and love, lead us in a word to religion. Finally, it is to be borne in mind that the century in which the poet lived was one of the earliest in which such questions were propounded, and sketches of nature made."—Comp. the still more decided appreciation of the contents of our discourse as respects its natural theology and its æsthetic features in the book of Jos. L. Saalschütz, entitled *Form und Geist der biblisch-hebräischen Poesie*, Königsb., 1853, (Third Lecture: *Biblisch-hebräische Naturanschauung und Natur-poesie*); also Ad. Kohut's *Alexander v. Humboldt und das Judenthum*, Leipzig, 1871 (Fourth Part: *Humboldt's Stellung zur Bibel*), also the striking observations of Reuss, in his *Vortrag über das Buch Job* towards the end), which show with peculiar beauty how that, notwithstanding the vast enlargement of our knowledge of nature in modern times, the larger number of the questions here addressed by Jehovah to Job, still remain as unanswerable as at the time when the poem was composed; the fact being that it is only the old formulas in respect to particular mysterious phenomena which have disappeared before a clearer and fuller knowledge, not the mysteries themselves, and that accordingly even to the naturalist of the present, God remains a hidden God. See further on this subject in the Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks on the following discourse of God (ch. xl. 41).

2. Notwithstanding all the admiration which this first discourse of Jehovah evokes in view of the evidences here presented of its beauty, and in particular of the value of its contributions to natural theology, we might still continue in doubt respecting *its congruity to the plan and connection of the poem as a whole.* It might seem singular and incongruous: (1) That the discourse from beginning to end runs through a series of *questions* from God to Job, calculated to shame and humiliate the latter, when he has already (ch. ix. 3) declared his shrinking from such a rigid inquisition, and his inability to answer even *one* in a thousand of such questions as the Most High might ask of him. (2) Fault might be found moreover with the *contents* of these questions, as exhibiting too little that is new, that has not already been touched upon, as being in too close agreement with what has been advanced by Job himself in respect to the greatness and wisdom revealed in the Cosmos, as being therefore too exclusively physical, *i. e.* as being too little adapted to produce a direct impression on the inward perversity and blindness of him who is addressed (an objection which has in fact been to some extent urged by some expositors and critics, as *e. g.* by de Wette, Knobel, Arnheim, *etc.*). The first of these objections, however, is directed against what is simply a misconception; for that declaration of Job in respect to his inability to answer God is made only incidentally, and in no wise conditions the final issue of the action of the poem. On the contrary Job had in the course of his discourses wished often enough that God might enter into a controversy with him. And, most of all, the questions which God puts to him, and of which he cannot answer one, are significantly related in the way of contrast to the last of the presumptuous challenges which Job had put forth. Whereas in ch. xxxi. 35 he had exclaimed: "Let the Almighty answer me!" God now fulfils this wish, although in quite another way than that which he had expected. He speaks to him out of the storm, not however by way of reply or self-vindication, but throughout asking questions, and so overwhelming the presumptuous fault-finder with a series of unanswerable queries, permanently silencing him, and compelling him at last to acknowledge his submission. At the same time the tendency of these divine questions is by no means to stun, to crush, to annihilate. Here and there it is true their tone borders on irony (see especially ch. xxxviii. 21, 28; xxxix. 1 seq.). It never, however, becomes harsh or haughty; on the contrary it is throughout affectionately condescending, lifting up at the same time that it humbles, gently administering instruction and consolation.—And as with this interrogative form of the discourse, so also is its natural theology thoroughly suited to the divine purpose in regard to Job. That self-humiliation, that silent submission to the divine will as being always and in every case wise, just and good, which was to be wrought in Job, how could it have been more suitably promoted than by pointing him to the visible creation, which already in and of itself is full, nay which overflows with facts adapted to vanquish all human pride and presumption? And especially may we ask in respect to that presumptuous argument, on which Job had continually planted himself in opposition to God: "I have not transgressed; therefore my grievous suffering is absolutely inexplicable—nay more, is unreasonable and unjust,"—how could

the error and folly of that position have been more effectually demonstrated to him than by a reference to the numberless inexplicable and incomprehensible subjects which continually present themselves to us in the realms of nature, in its life, processes and events? how could the doubt respecting the logical and ethical grounds of the apparently harsh treatment to which God had subjected him, be more effectually disposed of than by bringing forward various phenomena of physical life on earth and elsewhere, each one of which stands before us as an amazing wonder, and as an eloquent witness of the unsearchableness of God's ways, who in what He does is ever wise, and whose purpose is ever one of love? Comp. Delitzsch (II., p. 354): "From the marvellous in nature, he divines that which is marvellous in his affliction. His humiliation under the mysteries of nature is at the same time humiliation under the mystery of his affliction." And a little before (p. 352): "Contrary to expectation, God begins to speak with Job about totally different matters from His justice or injustice in reference to his affliction. Therein already lies a deep humiliation for Job. But a still deeper one is God's turning, as it were, to the *abecedarium naturæ*, and putting the censurer of His doings to the blush. That God is the almighty and all-wise Creator and Ruler of the world, that the natural world is exalted above human knowledge and power, and is full of marvellous divine creations and arrangements, full of things mysterious and incomprehensible to ignorant and feeble man, Job knows even before God speaks, and yet he must now hear it, because he does *not know it rightly;* for the nature with which he is acquainted as the herald of the creative and governing power of God, is also the preacher of humility; and exalted as God the Creator and Ruler of the natural world is above Job's censure, so is He also as the author of His affliction. That which is new therefore in the speech of Jehovah is not the proof of God's exaltation in itself, but *the relation to the mystery of his affliction, and to his conduct towards God in this his affliction, in which Job is necessitated to place perceptions not in themselves strange to him.* He who cannot answer a single one of those questions taken from the natural kingdom, but, on the contrary, must everywhere admire and adore the power and wisdom of God—he must appear as an insignificant fool, if he applies them to his limited judgment concerning the Author of his affliction."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

In the homiletic treatment of this first discourse of Jehovah's, it will be necessary of course to explain its position in the structure of the poem as a whole, and the significance of its contents for the solution of the problem of the book. All that pertains to this, however, will evidently possess only a subordinate practical value. For the practical treatment, on the contrary, it is of the highest importance suitably to set forth the value of the contents of the discourse for *modern* doubters, or those who after Job's fashion find fault with divine providence; to show accordingly that the questions contained in it touching natural theology are still in a certain sense unanswerable, and that the mysteries to which allusion is made ever remain real mysteries, even to the greatest intellects in the world of science. In this connection use might be made, in the way of illustration and exemplification, of the many confessions which have been made by the greatest investigators of nature touching the incompleteness and limitation of all earthly knowledge and of all the discoveries which have hitherto been achieved in the department of natural science (especially the confessions of astronomers like Newton, Herschel, A. V. Humboldt, Laplace, and recently by Proctor [*Other worlds than ours*, Preface], and also by chemists and biologists, such as J. V. Liebig, Darwin, Laugel, *etc.*) The phenomena described in the first half of the discourse (chap. xxxviii. 4-38), derived from the consideration of the heavens and of atmospheric meteorology, being pre-eminently rich in convincing examples of the mystery and unsearchableness which characterize the divine procedure in the economy of nature, also admit evidently of being considered with particular thoroughness (as *e. g.*, a point which obviously suggests itself—by calling attention in connection with such passages as ver. 22 seq., ver. 29 seq. to the fruitlessness, and indeed the hopelessness of the attempts hitherto made to reach the North Pole). The zoological and biological phenomena, on the other hand, which form the subject of the second half of the divine description, it will be better to present together in brief outline, in so far at least as the purpose of illustrating the incomprehensibility of the divine agency in creating and governing the universe is concerned. This second series of natural facts on the contrary are all the better suited to the basis of meditations on the fatherly love of God which remembers and cares for all His creatures, whether brutes or men.

Particular Passages.

Chap. xxxviii. 4 seq. Brentius: The aim of this discourse is to show that no one has the right to accuse the Lord of injustice. The proof of this point is that the Lord alone is the Creator of all things, which with a certain amplification is illustrated from various classes of creatures. . . . From the history of these creatures God proves that it is permitted to no one to accuse Divine sovereignty of injustice, or to resist it; for of all creatures not one was the Lord's counsellor, or rendered Him any aid in the creation of the world. He can without any injustice therefore dispose of all creatures according to His own will, and create one vessel to honor, another to dishonor, as it may please Him.—Oecolampadius: No other reason can be given than His own good pleasure why God did not make the earth ten times larger. He had the power to enlarge it, no less than to confine it within such narrow limits; He would have been able to make valleys, where there are mountains, and conversely, *etc.* But He is Lord, and it pleased Him to assign to things the length and depth and breadth which they now have.—Cramer: That God, who has from eternity dwelt in inaccessible light, has revealed Himself through

the work of creation, receives its explanation out of the depth of His great goodness and mercy. When therefore we treat of God, of His works and mysteries, we must do it with beseeming modesty and reverence. . . . . If even the book of nature transcends our ability to decipher it fully, how much more incomprehensible and mysterious will the book of Holy Scripture be for us.—VON GERLACH: The fundamental thought of these representations which God here puts forth is that only He who can create and govern all things, who superintends everything and adjusts all things in their relation to each other, can also comprehend the connection of human destinies. Inasmuch however as feeble short-sighted man cannot understand and fathom the created things which are daily surrounding him, how can he assume to himself any part of God's agency in administering the universe?

Chap. xxxviii. 16 seq. VON GERLACH: Of the particular subject here referred to [scientific discoveries in the natural world], it is true that the later researches of mankind have accomplished much, only however to reveal new depths of this immeasurable creation. In seeking to penetrate into the meaning of these words, we are not to dwell on the literal features of each separate statement. It is a poetic and splendid description of the greatness and unsearchableness of God in creation, from the point of view which men then occupied, a description which retains its lofty internal truth, although the letter of it, regarded from the stand-point of our present knowledge of nature no longer seems as striking to us as the ancients. Indeed it may be said that this more thorough investigation of natural laws has itself vastly increased the number and greatness of such wonders as are set forth in this description for him who enters into the *spirit* of it.

Chap. xxxviii. 39 seq.; xl. 1 seq. CRAMER: The volume of natural history [*das Thierbuch*] which God here writes out for us, should be a genuine text-book to all the virtues.—STARKE: If animals, whether strong or despicable, great or small, are embraced in God's merciful providential care, we can regard their need as a silent appeal to the goodness of the Lord, and in this sense even the ravens cry to God when they cry out from hunger.

Chap. xxxix. 27 seq. VICT. ANDREA: From that which is here intimated (to wit, that other animals must sacrifice their life, in order to satisfy the blood-thirsty brood of an eagle) do we not see that the suffering of a simple creature might in God's plan be designed *to benefit other creatures of God?*—So the death of a man may, through the terrifying effect which it has on others, often be a blessing to them. And how often is severe sickness, wholly irrespective of the end which the suffering may have for the patient himself, *a most effective school of sympathy, yea, of the most self-sacrificing love* for all who surround the sufferer. Very often such a sufferer, if he diligently strives to exhibit in his own person a pattern of resignation and praise to God, has been a rich source of light and blessing for those who are round about him! How short-sighted it is therefore for the sick to complain that their life is wholly without use, that they are only a burden to those who are about them, *etc.* In short the majesty of God has only to *question* man, in order to bring into the clearest consciousness his narrow limitations.

Second Discourse of Jehovah (*together with Job's answer*):

To doubt God's justice, which is most closely allied to His wonderful omnipotence, is a grievous wrong, which must be atoned for by sincere penitence:

CHAPTERS XL. 6—XLII. 6.

1. Sharp rebuke of Job's presumption, which has been carried to the point of doubting God's justice:

CHAPTER XL. 6-14.

VER. 6. Then answered the Lord unto Job out of the whirlwind, and said:

7 Gird up thy loins now like a man:
I will demand of thee, and declare thou unto me.
8 Wilt thou also disannul my judgment?
wilt thou condemn me that thou mayest be righteous?
9 Hast thou an arm like God?
or canst thou thunder with a voice like Him?
10 Deck thyself now with majesty and excellency,
and array thyself with glory and beauty.

11 Cast abroad the rage of thy wrath;
and behold every one that is proud, and abase him.
12 Look on every one that is proud, and bring him low;
and tread down the wicked in their place.
13 Hide them in the dust together:
and bind their faces in secret.
14 Then will I also confess unto thee
that thine own right hand can save thee.

2. Humiliating exhibition of the weakness of Job in contrast with certain creatures of earth, not to say with God; shown

a. by a description of the behemoth (hippopotamus):

VERS. 15-24.

15 Behold now behemoth,
which I made with thee;
he eateth grass as an ox.
16 Lo now, his strength is in his loins,
and his force is in the navel of his belly.
17 He moveth his tail like a cedar:
the sinews of his stones are wrapped together.
18 His bones are as strong pieces of brass;
his bones are like bars of iron.
19 He is the chief of the ways of God:
He that made him can make his sword to approach unto him.
20 Surely the mountains bring him forth food,
where all the beasts of the field play.
21 He lieth under the shady trees,
in the covert of the reed, and fens.
22 The shady trees cover him with their shadow;
the willows of the brook compass him about.
23 Behold, he drinketh up a river, and hasteth not:
he trusteth that he can draw up Jordan in his mouth.
24 He taketh it with his eyes:
his nose pierceth through snares.

b. by a description of the leviathan (crocodile): CHAP. XL. 25—XLI. 26 [E. V. CHAP. XLI. 1-34].

E.V. [Heb.]
XLI. [XL.]
1 [25] Canst thou draw out leviathan with a hook?
or his tongue with a cord which thou lettest down?
2 [26] Canst thou put a hook into his nose?
or bore his jaw through with a thorn?
3 [27] Will he make many supplications unto thee?
will he speak soft words unto thee?
4 [28] Will he make a covenant with thee?
wilt thou take him for a servant for ever?
5 [29] Wilt thou play with him as with a bird?
or wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?
6 [30] Shall the companions make a banquet of him?
shall they part him among the merchants?
7 [31] Canst thou fill his skin with barbed irons?
or his head with fish spears?
8 [32] Lay thine hand upon him,
remember the battle, do no more.

[XLI.]
9 [1] Behold the hope of him is in vain:
shall not one be cast down even at the sight of him?

10 [2] None is so fierce that dare stir him up;
who then is able to stand before Me?
11 [3] Who hath prevented me that I should repay him?
whatsoever is under the whole heaven is mine.

12 [4] I will not conceal his parts,
nor his power, nor his comely proportion.
13 [5] Who can discover the face of his garment?
or who can come to him with his double bridle?
14 [6] Who can open the doors of his face?
his teeth are terrible round about.
15 [7] His scales are his pride,
shut up together as with a close seal.
16 [8] One is so near to another,
that no air can come between them.
17 [9] They are joined one to another,
they stick together that they cannot be sundered.
18 [10] By his neesings a light doth shine,
and his eyes are like the eyelids of the morning.
19 [11] Out of his mouth go burning lamps,
and sparks of fire leap out.
20 [12] Out of his nostrils goeth smoke,
as out of a seething pot, or cauldron.
21 [13] His breath kindleth coals,
and a flame goeth out of his mouth.
22 [14] In his neck remaineth strength,
and sorrow is turned into joy before him.

23 [15] The flakes of his flesh are joined together:
they are firm in themselves; they cannot be moved.
24 [16] His heart is as firm as a stone;
yea, as hard as a piece of the nether millstone.
25 [17] When he raiseth up himself the mighty are afraid:
by reason of breakings they purify themselves.
26 [18] The sword of him that layeth at him cannot hold:
the spear, the dart, nor the habergeon.
27 [19] He esteemeth iron as straw,
and brass as rotten wood.
28 [20] The arrow cannot make him flee;
slingstones are turned with him into stubble.
29 [21] Darts are counted as stubble;
he laugheth at the shaking of a spear.
30 [22] Sharp stones are under him:
he spreadeth sharp-pointed things upon the mire.
31 [23] He maketh the deep to boil like a pot;
he maketh the sea like a pot of ointment.
32 [24] He maketh a path to shine after him;
one would think the deep to be hoary.
33 [25] Upon earth there is not his like,
who is made without fear.
34 [26] He beholdeth all high things:
he is a king over all the children of pride.

3. **Job's answer: Humble confession of the infinitude of the divine power, and penitent acknowledgment of his guilt and folly:**

CHAP. XLII. 1-6.

1 Then Job answered the Lord and said:

2 I know that Thou canst do everything,
and that no thought can be withholden from Thee.

3 "Who is he that hideth counsel without knowledge?"
therefore have I uttered that I understood not;
things too wonderful for me which I knew not;
4 Hear, I beseech Thee, and I will speak:
I will demand of Thee, and declare Thou unto me.
5 I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear;
but now mine eye seeth Thee:
6 Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent
in dust and ashes.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. That the omnipotent and infinitely wise activity of the Creator in nature is at the same time *just*, was in the first discourse of God affirmed for the most part only indirectly, or *implicite*. Only once, in ch. xxxviii. 13-15, was this aspect of His character expressly presented, and then only incidentally. The second discourse of Jehovah is intended to supply what is still lacking as to this point, to constrain Job fully to recognize the justice of God in all that He does, and in this way to vanquish the last remainder of pride and presumption in his heart. It accomplishes this end by a twofold method of treatment. First by the direct method of severely censuring the doubt which Job had uttered as to the divine justice, and by vindicating God's sole and exclusive claim to the power requisite for exercising sovereignty over the universe (first, and shorter part: chap. xl. 6-14). Next by the indirect method of attacking his pride through a lengthened description of two proud monster-beasts, mighty creations of God's hand, which after all the amazing wonder which their gigantic power calls forth, are nevertheless only instruments in the hand of the Almighty, and must submit, if not to the will of man, at least to the will of God, who crushes all tyrannous pride (second, and longer part: ch. xl. 15—xli. 26 [34]). This second part, which is again divided into two unequal halves—the shorter describing the behemoth—ch. xl. 15-24, the longer the leviathan, ch. xl. 25—xli. 26. [E. V., ch. xli. 1-34], falls back on the descriptive and interrogative tone of the first discourse of God; in contrast with which however it is characterized by an allegorizing tendency. It directly prepares the way for Job's second and last answer, in which he renews the humble submission which he had previously made, and strengthens it by a penitent confession of his own sinfulness.—The strophic arrangement of this second discourse of Jehovah is comprehensively simple and grand, corresponding to the contents, which are thoroughly descriptive, with a massive execution. It embraces in all five Long Strophes, of 8-12 verses each, not less than three of which are devoted to the description of the leviathan in ch. xl. 25—xli. 26, [E. V., ch. xli.] These five Long Strophes include indeed shorter subordinate divisions, but not, strictly speaking, regularly constructed strophes.—Against the modern objections to the authenticity of the episode referring to the behemoth and leviathan, see above in the *Introd.* § 9, II. (also the notice taken of the peculiar theory of Merx in the Preface).

2. *First Division* (Long Strophe): Severe censure of Job's presumptuous doubt respecting the justice of the divine course of action: ch. xl. 6-14.

Ver. 6. **Then answered Jehovah Job out of the storm,** *etc.*—This intentional repetition of ch. xxxviii. 1 is to show that God continues to present Himself to Job as one who, if not exactly burning with wrath towards him, would have him feel His mighty superiority. That here also, instead of מן סערה, the original text was מִנְהַסְּעָרָה, is evident from the Masorah itself. The absence of the art. ה, if it originally belonged here, is by no means to be explained, with Ramban, as designed to indicate that the storm was *no longer as violent as before.*—Ver. 7 precisely as in ch. xxxviii. 3.

Ver. 8. **Wilt thou altogether annul my right?**—הַאַף stands in a climactic relation to Job's "contending" (רֹב) reproved in ver. 2. "To break" (הפר) God's right would be the same as "to abolish, annul" the same (comp. ch. xv. 4). Job was on the point of becoming guilty of this wickedness, in that he sought to substitute what he assumed to be right, his idea of righteousness, for that of God, so that he might be accounted righteous, and God unjust, (see the second member).

Ver. 9. **Or hast thou an arm like God?**—וְאִם interrogative, as in ch. viii. 3; xxi. 4; xxxiv. 17. The "arm" of God as a symbol of His power, comp. ch. xxii. 8; so also the "thunder-voice" spoken of in the second member; comp. chap. xxxvii. 2 seq.—תַּרְעֵם, lit., "wilt, canst thou thunder? dost thou pledge thyself to thunder?"

Ver. 10. **Then put on majesty and grandeur,** as an ornament; clothe, deck thyself with these attributes of divine greatness and sovereignty (comp. Ps. civ. 1 seq.; xxi. 6 [5]. The challenge is intended ironically, since it demands of Job that which is in itself impossible; in like manner all that follows down to ver. 13 (comp. ch. xxxviii. 21).

Ver. 11. **Let the outbreakings of thy wrath pour themselves forth.**—הָפֵץ, *effundere*, to pour forth, to cause to gush forth, as in ch. xxxvii. 11; Prov. v. 16. עֶבְרוֹת, lit., "oversteppings," are here the overflowings, or outbreakings of wrath; comp. ch. xxi. 30; and for the thought, particularly in the second member, comp. Isa. ii. 12 seq. The fact that Jehovah ironically summons Job to display such manifestations of holy wrath and of stern retributive justice against sinners, conveys an indirect, but sufficiently clear and emphatic assurance of the truth that He Himself, Jehovah, governs the

world thus rigidly and justly; comp. above, ch. xxxviii. 13 seq.

Ver. 12. **Look on all that is proud, and bring it low.**—This almost verbal repetition of ver. 11 *b* is intended to emphasize the fact that at the moment when God casts His angry glance upon the wicked, the latter is cast down; comp. Ps. xxxiv. 17 [16].—**And overturn the wicked in their place.** הָדַךְ, *ἁπ. λεγ.*, "to throw down," or perhaps "to tread down" (related to דּוּךְ). In the latter case the passage might be compared with Rom. xvi. 20.—On תַּחְתָּם "in their place" [= "on the spot"], comp. chap. xxxvi. 20.

Ver. 13. **Hide them in the dust altogether**; *i. e.*, in the dust of the grave (hardly in holes of the earth, or of rocks, as though Isa. ii. 10 were a parallel passage).—**Shut up fast** (lit., "bind, fetter") **their faces in secret**, *i. e.*, in the interior of the earth, in the darkness of the realm of the dead; טָמוּן here substantially = שְׁאוֹל. Comp. the passage out of the Book of Enoch x. 5, cited by Dillmann: *καὶ τὴν ὄψιν αὐτοῦ πώμασον, καὶ φῶς μὴ θεωρείτω*.

Ver. 14. **Then will I too praise thee**, not only wilt thou praise thyself (comp. ver. 8)—**That thy right hand brings thee succor**; *i. e.*, that thou dost actually possess the power (the "arm," ver. 9) to put thy ideas of justice into execution with vigor; comp. the similar expressions in Ps. xliv. 4 [3]; Is. lix. 18; lxiii. 5 This conclusion of the rebuke which Jehovah administers directly to Job's insolent presumption, as though he only knew what is just, prepares at once the transition to the description which follows of the colossal animals which are introduced as eloquent examples of God's infinite creative power, which for the very reason of its being such is of necessity united to the highest justice.

3 *Second Division:* The descriptions of animals, given for the purpose of humiliating Job by showing his weakness, and the absolute groundlessness of his presumptuous pride.

a. The description of the behemoth: Verses 15-24.

Ver. 15. **Behold now the behemoth.**—Even Dillm., one of the most zealous opponents of the genuineness of the whole section, is obliged to admit that the connection with what precedes by means of הִנֵּה is an "easy" one. Moreover it is by no means one that is "purely external," for the behemoth is brought to Job's attention for the very purpose of illustrating the proposition that no creature of God's, however mighty, can succeed against Him, can "with his right hand obtain for himself help against Him" (see ver. 14 *b*). This is clearly enough indicated by the second member: **which I have made with thee**; *i. e.* as well as thee (עִם as though it were comparative, as in ch. ix. 26; comp. ch. xxxvii. 18). Job is bid to contemplate his fellow-creature, the behemoth, far huger and stronger than himself, that he may learn how insignificant and weak are all created beings in contrast with God, and in particular how little presumptuous and proud confidence in external things can avail against Him (comp. the passage of Horace: *Vis consili expers mole ruit sua, etc.*). The name בְּהֵמוֹת (which the ancient versions either misinterpreted as a plural [so the LXX.: *θηρία*], or left untranslated, as a proper name [Vulg., *etc.*]), in itself denotes, in accordance with the analogy of other plural formations with an intensive signification: "the *great* beast, the colossus of cattle, the monster animal." The word is, however, a Hebraized form of the Egyptian *p-ehe-mau*, "the water-ox" (p=the, ehe=ox, mau or mou=water), and like this Egypt. word (besides which indeed the hieroglyphic *apet* is more frequently to be met with), and the Ital. *bomarino*, it signifies the *Nile-horse*, or hippopotamus. For it is to this animal that the whole description which follows refers, as is most distinctly and unmistakably shown by the association with another monster of the Nile, the crocodile: not to the elephant, of which it is understood by Thom. Aquinas, Oecolampadius, the Zürich Bib., Drusius, Pfeifer, Le Clerc, Cocceius, Schultens, J. D. Michaelis [Scott, Henry. Good refers the description to some extinct pachyderm of the mammoth or mastodon species. Lee, following the LXX., understands it of the cattle, first collectively, and then distributively]. The correct view was taken by Bochart (*Hieroz.* iii. 705 seq.), and after him has been adopted by the great majority of moderns. With the following vivid description of this animal's way of living and form, beginning with the mention of his "eating grass" (supporting himself on tender plants, the reeds of the Nile, roots, *etc.*), may be compared Herod. ii. 69–71; Pliny viii. 25; Aben Batuta, ed. Defrem iv., p. 426; among the moderns, Rüppell: *Reisen in Nubien*, 1829, p. 52 seq.; and in particular Sir Sam. Baker in his travels, as in *The Nile and its Tributaries*, The *Albert Nyanza, etc.* (See extracts from these works, with striking illustrations of the hippopotamus in the *Globus*, Vol. XVII., 1870, Nos. 22–24) [Livingstone, *Travels and Researches*, p. 536].

Ver. 16. **Lo now, his strength is in his loins**, *etc.*—אוֹן as in ch. xviii. 7, 12. שְׁרִירִים in *b*, a word found only here (derived from the root שׁר, "to wind, to twist," which is contained also in שֹׁר, "navel," as also in שֹׁרֶשׁ, "root"), cannot signify the "bones," of which mention is first made in ver. 18 (against Wetzstein in Delitzsch), but the cords, the *sinews* and *muscles*, which in the case of the hippopotamus (not, however, of the elephant) are particularly firm and strong just in the region of the belly.

Ver. 17. **He bends his tail like a cedar**; *i. e.* like a cedar-bough; the *tert. comp.* lies in the straightness, firmness and elasticity of the tail of the hippopotamus (which is furthermore short, hairless, very thick at the root, of only a finger's thickness, however, at the end, looking therefore somewhat like the tail of the hog, but not at all like that of the elephant). יַחְפֹּץ, instead of being translated "he bends" (Targ.), may possibly be explained to mean "he stiffens, stretches out" (LXX., Vulg., Pesh.).—**The sinews of his thighs are firmly knit together**; or also "the veins of his legs" (by no means *nervi testiculorum ejus*, as the Vulg. and

Targ. [also E. V.] render it). With יְשָׂרְגוּ, "they are wrapped together, they present a thick, twig-like texture," comp. שָׂרִגִים, "vine-tendrils" [the interweaving of the vine-branches being before the poet's eye in his choice of the word. Del.].

Ver. 18. **His bones are pipes of brass.**—אֲפִיקִים here "pipes, tubes, channels," as in ch. xli. 7; comp. נַחַל, ch. xxviii. 4. נְחוּשָׁה, a word peculiar to our book, instead of the form which obtains elsewhere, נְחֹשֶׁת (comp. further ch. xx. 24; xxviii. 2; xli. 19). Concerning מְטִיל, "staff, pole, bar," probably the Semitic etymological basis of *μέταλλον*, comp. Delitzsch on the passage. In respect to the similes in both members of the verse, comp. Cant. v. 15 *a*.

Ver. 19. **He is a firstling of God's ways**; *i. e.* a master-piece of His creative power (comp. Gen. xlix. 3). רֵאשִׁית can all the more easily dispense with the article here, seeing that it denotes only priority of rank (as in Amos vi. 1, 6; comp. also בְּכוֹר in ch. xviii. 13, and often), not of time (as *e. g.* in Prov. viii. 22; Num. xxiv. 20). In respect to "God's ways" in the sense of the displays of His creative activity in creating and governing the universe, comp. ch. xxvi. 14. The whole clause refers to the immense size and strength of the hippopotamus, which, at least in length and thickness, if not in height, surpasses even the elephant, and overturns with ease the ships of the Nile, vessel, crew and cargo. In reality therefore there is no exaggeration in the statement; and only an exegetical misapprehension of it, and an idle attempt at allegorizing it (stimulated in the present instance by the resemblance to Prov. viii. 22) could have influenced the Jewish Commentators, and those of the ancient Church, to find in this designation of the behemoth as a "firstling of God's ways" a symbolic representation of *Satan* (comp. Book of Enoch, 60, 6 seq.; many Rabbis of the Middle Ages; the Pseudo-Melitonian *Clavis Scripturæ Sacræ* [in Pitra, *Spicileg. Salesm.* Vol. II.], Eucherius of Lyons in his *Formulæ maj. et minores* [*Idem*, Vol. III., p. 400 seq.], Gregory the Great, and most of the Church Fathers on the passage; Luther also in his marginal gloss on the passage, Brentius [see below, Doctrinal and Ethical Remarks.—The same view is taken moreover by Wordsworth, who explains: "It seems probable that *Behemoth* represents the Evil One acting in the animal and carnal elements of man's own constitution, and that *Leviathan* symbolizes the Evil One energizing as his *external* enemy. Behemoth is the enemy *within* us; Leviathan is the enemy *without* us"].—It only remains to say, that there is nothing surprising in the fact that here, in a discourse by God, He should speak of Himself in the third person; comp. above ch. xxxix. 17; xxxviii. 41.—**He who made him furnished to him his sword**, *viz.* his *teeth*, his two immense incisors (which according to Rüppell in *l. c.* grow to be twenty-six French inches long), with which as with a sickle (a *ἅρπη*, Nicander, *Theriac.* 566; Nonnus, *Dionysiac.* 26) he mows down the grass and green corn-blades. הָעֹשׂוֹ stands for הָעֹשֵׂהוּ, "He who hath made him, his Creator" (the article being used as demonstrative; comp. Gesenius § 109 [§ 108, 2, *a*]), and יַגֵּשׁ elliptically for יַגֵּשׁ לוֹ, "brought near to him, furnished to him." The emendation suggested by Böttcher and Dillmann—הֶעָשׂוּ instead of הָעֹשׂוֹ: "which was created [lit. plur. 'which were created'] so as to attach thereon a sword" (יַגֵּשׁ as Jussive)—is unnecessary, as is also Ewald's rendering of הִגִּישׁ in the sense of "to blunt, to make harmless."

Ver. 20 gives a reason for ver. 19 *b*: **For the mountains bring him forth food.**—בּוּל=יְבוּל, produce, fruit, vegetation. The clause is not intended to describe the hippopotamus as an animal that commonly or frequently grazes on the mountains (in point of fact it is only in exceptional instances that he ascends the mountains or high grounds, when the river-banks and the grounds immediately around them have been eaten up). It only intends to say that entire mountains, vast upland tracts, where large herds of other animals abide, must provide for him his food (see *b*).

Ver. 21 states where the hippopotamus is *in the habit* of staying: **He lies down under the lotus-trees, in the covert of reeds and fens** (comp. ch. viii. 11).—צֶאֱלִים, plur. of צֶאֱל, or of צֶאֱלָה (a word which occurs also in the Arabic), are not the lotus-flowers, *i. e.*, the water-lilies (*Nymphæa Lotus*) [so Conant], but the lotus-bushes, or trees (*Lotus silvestris s. Cyrenaica*), a vegetable growth frequently found in the hot and moist lowlands of Egypt, Cyrenaica, and Syria, with thorny branches, and a fruit like the plum. On *b* comp. the description of the hippopotamus given by Ammianus Marcellinus (XXII. 15): *Inter arundines celsas et squalentes nimia densitate hæc bellua cubilia ponit.*

Ver. 22. **Lotus-trees cover him as a shade.**—צִלְלוֹ (resolved from צִלּוֹ, like גִּלְלוֹ, ch. xx. 7, from גֵּלוֹ) is in apposition to the subject, with which it forms at the same time a paronomasia. Another paronomasia occurs between יְסֻכֻּהוּ and יְסֻבֻּהוּ in *b*.

Ver. 23. **Behold, the river shows violence; he trembles not**; lit., "he does not spring up, is not startled. הֵן at the beginning of this clause has, as in ch. xii. 14; xxiii. 8, substantially the force of a conditional particle. עָשַׁק here without an object: "to exercise violence, to act violently," (differing from ch. x. 3) a word which strikingly describes a river wildly swelling and raging [sweeping its borders with tyrannous devastation. E. V., following the Vulg. *absorbebit fluvium* (Targ. "he doth violence to the river") gives to עָשַׁק a meaning not warranted]. **He remains unconcerned** (lit. "he is confident") **when a Jordan rushes** (lit. "bursts through, pours itself forth," גִּיחַ as in chap. xxxviii. 8) **into his mouth.** The Jordan,

(יַרְדֵּן without the Art.) is used here in an appellative sense of a river remarkable for its swiftly rushing course, not as a proper name, for hippopotami scarcely lived in the Jordan. There is nothing strange in this mention of the Jordan in order vividly to illustrate the description, the same being a river well known to Job, and also to his friends. It certainly cannot be urged as an argument for the hypothesis that the author of this section is not the same with the author of the remainder of the book (against Ewald and Dillmann). ["The reason why the Jordan is the river particularly here used as an *illustration* is, I suppose, because not unlikely, rising as it does at the foot of the snow-clad Lebanon, it was liable to more *sudden* and violent swellings than either the Euphrates or the Nile. It is, in fact, more of a mountain torrent than either, and probably in its irruptions it drove away in consternation the lions and other wild beasts, located in the thickets on its banks." Carey. Comp. Jer. xii. 5 and xli. 19].

Ver. 24. **Before his eyes do they take him, pierce through his nose with snares.**—The position and tone of the words forbid one taking this verse as an ironical challenge: "Let one just take him!" or as a question: "Shall, or does any one take him," *etc.?* Instead of בְּעֵינָיו (*i. e.*, "while he himself is looking on, under his very eyes;" comp. Prov. i. 17), we must at least have read הַבְעֵינָיו. Moreover instead of the 3d Pers. we should rather have looked for the 2d, if either of the above constructions had been the true one (comp. the questions in ver. 25 seq.) [Ch. xli. 1 seq.]. The clause accordingly is to be taken, with the ancient versions, and with Stickel, Umbreit, Ewald, Dillmann [Conant] as descriptive of something which actually takes place, and hence as referring to the capture of the river-horse. By the ancients in like manner as by the Nubians of to-day this was accomplished by means of harpoons fastened to a long rope. It is either to this harpoon-rope, or to a switch drawn through the nose after the capture has been effected that the word מוֹקְשׁ in *b* refers. It can hardly mean a common trap (Delitzsch ["let one lay a snare which, when it goes into it, shall spring together and pierce it in the nose"]).—Why does God close the description of the hippopotamus with a reference to its capture? Evidently because He wishes thereby to emphasize the thought that this animal is wholly and completely in His power, that all its size and strength are of no avail to it, and that when God determines to deliver it into the hands of men, its pride is humbled without fail. Whereas on the other hand the description of the leviathan which follows contains *no* such reference to its capture, but sets forth throughout only the difficulty, or indeed the impossibility of becoming its master by the use of ordinary strength and cunning; this indicates an *advance* over what goes before.

4. *Continuation.* *b.* First part of the description of the *leviathan:* ch. xli. 1–11 [Heb. ch. xl. 25—xli. 3]: the untamableness and invincibility of the leviathan.—**Dost thou draw out the leviathan with a net?** [or as E. V., Gesen., Fürst, *etc.*, "with a hook"]. The name לִוְיָתָן denotes here neither the mythical dragon of heaven, as in ch. iii. 8 (see on the passage), nor the whale, as in Ps. civ. 26, but the *crocodile*, whose structure and mode of life are in the following description depicted with fidelity to the minutest particular (comp. the evidence in detail in Bochart, *Hieroz.* III., 737 seq.). In and of itself לִוְיָתָן is the generic name of any monster capable of *wreathing itself in folds*, in like manner as תַּנִּין (comp. τείνω) may denote any monster that is *long stretched out.* But as the latter name is become the prevalent designation of the whale, (see on ch. vii. 12), so the name leviathan seems to have attached itself from an early period to the crocodile, that particularly huge and terrible amphibious monster of Bible lands, for which animal there was no special name appropriated in the primitive Hebrew, as it was not indigenous to Palestine, or at all events was but rarely found in its waters (traces indeed are not absolutely wanting of its having existed in them at one time: see the remarks of Robinson in respect to the coast-river Nahr ez Zerka, or Maat-Temsâh ["crocodile-waters"], and also in respect to the city Crocodilon, not far from Cesarea, in his "Physical Geography," *etc.*, p. 191). The name leviathan does not involve the Hebraizing of an Egyptian name of the crocodile, (analogous to that of *pe-ehe-mou* in behemoth). By so much the more probable is it that in the interrogative תִּמְשֹׁךְ "drawest thou" (without הֲ, see Ew., § 324, *a*), the poet intends an allusion to the well-known Egyptian name of the animal, which in Copt. is *temsah,* in modern Arab. *timsah* (Ew., Del., Dillm., *etc*).—**Dost thou with a cord press down his tongue?** *i. e.*, when, like a fish, he has bitten the fishing-hook, dost thou, in pulling the line, cause it to press down the tongue? The question is not (with Schult., Hirzel, Delitzsch, *etc.*) to be rendered: "Canst thou sink a line into his tongue [or "his tongue into a line"]? a rendering which is indeed verbally admissible, but which yields an idea that is not very intelligible. This member expresses, only with a little more art, the same thought as the first. It is not at all necessary to assume (with Ewald, Dillmann and other opponents of the genuineness of the present section), that the poet represents the capture of the crocodile as absolutely impossible, thus contradicting the fact attested by Herodotus, II., 7, that the ancient Egyptians caught this animal with fishing-hooks. That which the ironical question of God denies is simply the possibility of overcoming this animal, like a harmless fish, *with ordinary craft or artifice*, not the possibility of ever capturing it.—There is nothing to forbid the assumption that instead of the Egyptian crocodile (or at least *along with* it) the author had in view a Palestinian species or variety of the same animal, which is no longer extant, and that this Palestinian crocodile, just because it was rarer than the saurian of the Nile, was in fact held to be impossible of capture, (comp. Delitzsch II, p. 366, n. 2). It is, generally speaking, a very precarious position to question the accuracy of our poet's statements even in a *single* point: compare *e. g.*, the per-

fectly correct mention in this passage of the *tongue* of the crocodile, with the ridiculous assertion of Herodot. (II. 68), Aristotle, and other ancients, that the crocodile *has no tongue.*

Ver 2 [XL. 26]. **Canst thou put a rush-ring into his nose, and bore through his jaw** (or, "his cheek") **with a hook?**—*i. e.*, canst thou deal with him as fishermen deal with the fish captured by them, piercing their mouths with iron hooks in order afterwards to thrust through them rush-cords (σχοίνους), or iron rings (the fishermen of the Nile use the latter to this day, see Bruce, *Travels, etc.*), and to lay the fish thus tied together in the water?

Ver. 3 [XL. 27.] **Will he make many supplications to thee,** *etc.*, *i. e.*, will he speak thee fair, in order to retain his freedom? The question which follows in ver. 28 enlarges upon this thought, with a somewhat different application. "For a servant for ever" is here equivalent to "for a tamed domestic animal" (comp. ch. xxxix. 9).

Ver. 5 [XL. 29]. **Wilt thou play with him as with a bird?**—שִׂחֵק בְּ differently from Ps. civ. 26, where it signifies to play *in* something. By the "bird" here spoken of is meant neither the "golden beetle" (which in the language of the Talmud is called "bird of the vineyard"), nor the grasshopper (comp. Lewysohn, *Zool. des Talmud.* § 364). We are rather to compare with it the sparrow of Catullus: *Passer, deliciæ meæ puellæ*, and, as in that poem, we are to understand by the נערות "female slaves;" scarcely the "little daughters" of the one who is addressed (as Dillmann thinks, who takes pains to exhibit here a new reason for suspecting the genuineness of this section).

Ver. 6 [XL. 30]. **Do fishermen—partners trade in him? [do they divide him among the Canaanites?]** חַבָּרִים (different from חֲבֵרִים Is. xliv. 11) are fishermen as members of a guild, or as partners in a company associated together for the capture of fish; comp. Luke v. 7, 10. יִכְרוּ with עַל as in chap. vi. 27, "to make bargains for anything, to traffic with it;" not "to feast upon anything, to make a banquet," as the phrase is rendered by the LXX. (ἐνσιτοῦνται), Targum [E. V.], Schult., Rosenmüller, *etc.*; for כָּרָה "to banquet" (2 Kings vi. 23) agrees neither with the construction with עַל, nor the mention of the "Canaanites," *i. e.*, the Phenician merchants (Is. xxiii. 8; Zech. xiv. 21; Prov. xxxi. 24) in the second member. [Gesenius, Conant, *etc.*, less simply take כָּרָה in its more usual sense, "to dig," *i. e.*, dig pits, lay snares for. Merx. reads יִכֹּרוּ from כרר, and translates: The animal, against which hunters go in troops].

Ver. 7 [XL. 31]. Not only is the crocodile unsuited to be an article of commerce, but coated as he is with scales, he is equally unsuited to be the object of an exciting harpoon-hunt. With שֻׂכּוֹת, "pointed darts," comp. the Arab. *sauke*, which signifies both "thorn" and "spear."

Ver. 8 [XL. 32]. **Remember the battle, thou wilt not do it again**—*i. e.*, shouldst thou presume to fight with him (זְכֹר, not Infinit. dependent on תּוֹסַף, but Imperat. consecut., comp. Ew., § 347, b), thou wilt not repeat the experiment (תּוֹסַף pausal form for תּוֹסֶף, see Ew., § 224, b). Needless violence is done to this verse also, if (as by Dillmann) the attempt be made to deduce from it the idea of the absolute impossibility of capturing and conquering the crocodile. Let it be borne in mind that the words are addressed to *a single individual.*

Ver. 9 [XLI. 1]. **Behold, every hope is disappointed**; lit. "behold, *his* hope is disappointed," that *viz.* of the man who should enter into a contest with the monster (the use of the suffix accordingly being similar to that of chap. xxxvii. 12). **Even at the sight of him one is cast down**; lit. as a question: "is one cast down?" *etc.*; *i. e.*, is it not the fact that the mere sight of him is enough to cast one down with terror? On מַרְאָיו, which is not plur. but sing. comp. Gesenius, § 93 [§ 91], 9, Rem.

Ver. 10 [XL. 2]. **None so fool-hardy that he would stir him up.**—לֹא is not, without further qualification, = אֵין (Hirz.), but the lacking subj. is to be supplied out of the next member, and the whole clause is exclamatory: "not fierce (fool-hardy, rash) enough, that he should rouse him up!" Respecting אַכְזָר, (comp. chap. xxx. 21. **And who will take his stand before Me?**—*i. e.*, appear against Me as Mine adversary; התיצב here in another sense than in chap. i. 6; ii. 1. According to some MSS. and the Targ. the text should be לְפָנָיו, referring to the crocodile: and who will stand before *him?*" But this would destroy the characteristic fundamental thought of the verse, which consists in a *conclusio a min. ad majus:* "If no one ventures to stir up that creature which I have made, how much less will any one dare to contend with Me, the Almighty Creator?"

Ver. 11 [3]. **Who gave to me first of all that I must requite it?**—*i. e.*, who would dare to appear against me as my accuser or my enemy, on the ground that he has perchance given me something, and is thus become my creditor? (Rom. xi. 35). As to the second half of the verse which gives the reason for the question, in which God claims all created beings as His property, comp. Psalm l. 10 seq.; on תַּחַת כָּל־הַשָּׁמַיִם see ch. xxviii. 24; on the neuter הוּא see ch. xiii. 16; xv. 9.—The general thoughts advanced in ver. 2 *b*, and ver. 3 are a suitable close to what is said of the invincibility of the crocodile, as a mighty illustration of God's creative power, so that we are required neither to transpose the passage (as *e. g.*, by placing it after ch. xl. 14), nor to deem it out of place here, between the description of the leviathan's untamableness, and that of his bodily structure (against Dillmann).

5. *Conclusion; c. Second part of the description of the leviathan:* The bodily structure and mode of life characteristic of the leviathan, the king of all proud beasts: ch. xl. 12-34 [4-26].

Ver. 12 [4]. **I will not keep silent as to his members** (בַּדִּים, see ch. xviii. 13). So ac-

cording to the K'thibh לֹא אַחֲרִישׁ; the K'ri לוֹ אח׳ would give the idea in the form of a question: "as to him should I pass his limbs in silence?" which as being a little more difficult is to be preferred. In no case does the clause deserve to be called "a prosaic and precise announcement of the subject to be treated of," such as would seem to be "not very suitable" in a discourse delivered by God (Dillmann): the idea of the ancients touching what might be suitable and in taste, and what might not be so, were quite different from our modern notions. **Nor as to the fame of his powers** (so Vaihinger strikingly); lit. "nor of the word of his powers" *i. e.*, of their kind and arrangement (Ewald), how the case stands with respect to them; comp. דָּבָר in Deut. xv. 2; xix. 4. In the final clause וְחִין עֶרְכּוֹ the word עֵרֶךְ is in any case equivalent to "disposition, structure" (Aq.: *τάξις*), and הִין seems to be a secondary form of חֵן=comeliness, gracefulness, with which the tenor of this description which follows well agrees, setting forth as it does not only that which is fearful, but also that which is beautiful and elegant in the structure of the leviathan. For this reason it is unnecessary either with Ewald to identify the word with הִין, "measure" (dry measure), or with Dillmann to amend the text (to עֵין? or חִסֵּן?)

Vers. 13-17 [5-9]: The upper and foreside [face] of the crocodile.—**Who has uncovered the face of his garment?** *i. e.*, no one can uncover, lift up the upper side (פָּנִים as in Isa. xxv. 7) of his scaly coat of mail; this lies on his back with such tenacity that it cannot be removed, nor broken. [Others, Ewald, Schlott., *etc.*, explain פָּנִים of the anterior part of his garment, or armor, that which pertains to the head or face; but this would be less natural, and would involve tautology—the "opening of the jaws" being referred to again in the next ver.]. —**Into his double jaws who enters in?**— Lit., "into the double of his jaws;" רֶסֶן here accordingly in a different sense from ch. xxx. 11 [where it means "bridle," the meaning which E. V. gives to it here]. The fact mentioned by Herod. II., 68, and confirmed by modern observations, to wit, that a little bird, the plover, (*Charadrius Ægyptius*, in Herod. *τροχίλος*) enters the open jaw of the crocodile, in order to look for insects there, need not be deemed unknown to our author; only we are not to insist on his having such an incident in mind in the passage before us.

Ver. 14 [6]. **The doors of his face—who has opened them?** *i. e.*, his jaws, his mouth, the aperture of which reaches back of the eyes and ears (comp. the well-known picture, taken from the *Description de l'Egypte*, and introduced into several pictorial works on zoology, *e. g.*, into Klotz and Glaser's *Leben und Eigenthümlichkeiten der mittleren und niederen Thierwelt*, Leipzig, 1869, p. 15, representing the mouth of a crocodile wide open, with a *Charadrius* in it). —**Round about his teeth is terror**; comp. ch. xxxix. 20. The crocodile has thirty-six long, pointed teeth in the upper jaw, and thirty in the lower, the appearance of which is all the more terrible that they are not covered by the lips.

Ver. 15 [7]. **A pride are the furrows of the shields** (comp. ch. xl. 18), referring to the arched bony shields, of which the animal has seventeen rows, all equally large and square in form. [According to this interpretation אֲפִיקֵי means first channels, and then the shields bounded by those channels. Others (Gesenius, Conant, *etc.*) take it as an adj. = *robusta* (*robora*) *scutorum*].—**Fastened together like a closely-fitting seal**; or, construing חוֹתָם צַר not as appositional, but as instrumental accusative (according to Ewald, § 297, *b*): "fastened together as with a closely-fitting seal" [so E. V.]. How this is to be understood is shown by the two verses which follow; in which comp., as to the phrase, אִישׁ בְּאָחִיהוּ, Gesen., § 124. [§ 122], Rem. 4; as to the verbs דבק and יתלכד, chap. xxxviii. 30, 38.

Vers. 18-21 [10-13]. The sneezing and breathing of the crocodile.—**His sneezing flashes forth light** (תָּהֶל, abbreviated from תָּהֵל, Hiph. of הלל, comp. chap. xxxi. 26); *i. e.*, when the crocodile turned toward the sun with open jaws is excited to sneezing (which in such a posture happens very easily, see Bochart III., 753 seq.), the water and slime gushing from his mouth glisten brilliantly in the sunbeams. As Delitz. says truly: "This delicate observation of nature is here compressed into three words; in this concentration of whole, grand thoughts and pictures, we recognize the older poet."—**And his eyes are as eyelids of the dawn** (chap. iii. 9); *i. e.*, when with their red glow they glimmer in the water, before the animal's head becomes visible above the surface of the water. This cat-like sparkle of the crocodile's eyes was observed from an early period, and is the reason why in the ancient Egyptian hieroglyphics two crocodiles' eyes became the hieroglyph for the dawn, according to the express statement of Horus, *Hierogl.* I., 68: *ἐπειδὴ πρὸ παντὸς σώματος ζῶον οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐκ τοῦ βύθου ἀναφαίνονται.*

Ver. 19 [11]. **Out of his mouth proceed torches**; *i. e.*, not literal torches, but streams of water shining like torches, when the animal emerging out of the water breathes violently.—**Out of his nostrils goes forth smoke, like a seething pot with reeds** [lit., "like a kettle blown and reeds"]; *i. e.*, like a heated kettle standing over a crackling and strongly smoking fire of reeds (Ewald, Böttcher, Delitzsch, Dillm.) [Conant]. The common rendering is: "as a seething pot and caldron;" but אַגְמוֹן is scarcely to be taken to signify something else here than above in ch. xl. 26 [xli. 2]; "caldron" would be אַגָּן, Arab. *iggane*. With the description before us, as well as with the still more strongly hyperbolical description in the verse which follows, comp. the description of Bochart, *l. c.*: *Tum spiritus diu pressus sic effervescit et erumpit tam violenter, ut flammas ore et naribus videatur evomere.* Also what the traveler Bartram (in Rosenmüller's *Alterth.*, p. 250) relates of an alligator in Carolina, that a thick smoke streamed out of its distended nostrils, with a noise which made the

earth shake. [Schlottmann calls attention to the close parallelism between vers. 18, 19 and vers. 20, 21].

Ver. 22 [14]. **On his neck dwells** (lit., "passes the night, lodges," יָלִין as in ch. xvii. 2) **strength, and despair danceth hence before him.** תָּדוּץ, leaps, springs up suddenly. Both members of the verse refer to the crocodile suddenly emerging out of the water, and terrifying men or beasts, and particularly to the violent movements of its neck or head, which are sufficient to overturn ships, *etc.* ["The trepidation, the confused running to and fro of one who is in extreme anguish (comp. יתחטאו ver. 17) is compared to the dancing of one who is crazed, and this is attributed to the דאבה as the personification of the anguish." Schlott.—E. V., less suitably: "and sorrow is turned into joy before him"].

Ver. 23 [15] seq., describe the lower and hinder parts of the animal.—**The flanks** [מפלי, the flabby pendulous parts of the body, especially the belly] **of his flesh are closely joined together, are fixed fast upon him, are not moved**; *i. e.*, they do not shake with the motions of the body, being thickly lined with strong scales, smaller however than those on the back. יָצוּק, pass. partic. of יצק, differing accordingly from ch. xxviii. 2; xxix. 6.

Ver. 24 [16]. **His heart is firmly cast as a stone, firmly cast as a nether millstone,** [not as E. V., "as a piece of the nether millstone," for פלח, as that which is split off, or produced by cleavage, refers to the whole stone; hence elsewhere (Judg. ix. 53; 2 Sam. xxiv. 6), פֶּלַח רֶכֶב for the *upper* millstone]. It was necessary that the nether millstone should be particularly hard, because it has to bear the weight and friction of the upper stone; comp. the Biblical Archæologies and Dictionaries, under the word "Mill." Besides the physical hardness of the crocodile's heart (in respect to which comp. Arist. *De partib. animal.* 3, 4), the poet here has in view the firmness of his heart in the tropical or ethical sense, *i. e.*, the courage and fierceness of the beast, as the following verses show clearly enough.

Ver. 25 [17]. **At his rising up heroes tremble.**—אֵלִים, or, as many MSS. read אֵלִים, "mighty ones," from אול, "to be thick, strong;" comp. Ex. xv. 15 with Ezek. xxxi. 11; xxxii. 21. מִשֵּׁתוֹ, contracted from מִשְּׂאֵתוֹ, cannot mean here "before his majesty" (ch. xiii. 11; xxxi. 23), but simply: "at his rising, when he raises himself up."—**From terror they miss their aim.** מִשְּׁבָרִים, lit., "from brokenness [breakings];" not however "from wounds." Jerome correctly: *territi* (comp. Isa. lxv. 14). התחטא, lit., "they miss," *i. e.*, "their mark" (to wit, here, the slaying of the monster). [Gesenius, Conant, *etc.*, "they lose themselves for terror," spoken of a person in astonishment and terror missing his way in precipitate flight.—Fürst: "they disappear, *i. e.*, they cannot hold out."—E. V., under the influence of the Vulg. and Targ. "by reason of breakings they purify themselves," which hardly yields an intelligible meaning].

Ver. 26 [18]. **If one reaches him with the sword,** lit., he who reaches him with the sword, **it doth not hold,** *i. e.*, the sword, (lit., "it does not get up"), it glances off without effect from the scaly armor of the beast. As to the construction comp. Ewald, § 357, c; on the use of בְּלִי with the finite verb, which occurs *only here*, Ew., § 322, a. In the second member, which introduces three additional subjects to the verb תָּקוּם, this בְּלִי is to be again supplied: "nor spear, dart, and armor."—According to the testimony of the ancient versions it would seem that שִׁרְיָה must be rendered as a synonym of שִׁרְיוֹן, "coat of mail," although the context, and a comparison with the Arab. *sirwe*, or *surwe*, "arrow," would favor rather the meaning "missile," either the harpoon, or some peculiar kind of arrow. For מַסָּע the definition "sling-stone" has the support of the Targ., while the LXX and the Vulg. associate the word with the preceding חֲנִית in the sense of *hasta missilis*.

Verses 27-29 [19-21] describe more at length the ineffective rebound of ordinary human weapons from the armor of the leviathan, together with the animal's fearlessness in encountering all assaults by means of such weapons. Respecting נְחוּשָׁה in ver. 19, *b*, comp. on ch. xl. 18. רִקָּבוֹן in the same member is a poetic form for רָקָב (chap. xiii. 28). The "son of the bow," ver. 20 *a* is the arrow, as the "son of the flame" in ch. v. 7 meant the spark of fire. The "turning to stubble," ver. 20 *b* is of course to be taken only in the subjective sense of becoming as it were stubble.

Ver. 29 [21]. **Clubs are accounted** (by him) **as chaff**; lit. "a club;" תּוֹתָח, as a generic term, is construed with the plur. On *b* (רַעַשׁ and כִּידוֹן), comp. ch. xxxix. 23, 24.

Ver. 30 [22] continues the description of the under side of the body begun in ver. 23 [16]. **His under parts are pointed shards**; lit. "the sharpest of shards," חַדּוּדֵי חָרֶשׂ; on this mode of expressing the superlative, which occurs also in ch. xxx. 6, comp. Gesen., § 112 [§ 110], Rem. 1. The comparison of the scales on the under side of the crocodile, and especially on his tail, with pointed sherds, is found also in Aelian, *H. N.* 10, 24. **He spreadeth a threshing sledge upon the mire**; *i. e.*, by means of those same pointed scales, which leave a mark on the soft mire, like that made by the iron spikes of a threshing-sledge (comp. Is. xxviii. 27).

Ver. 31 [23]. **He maketh the deep to boil like a pot.**—On הִרְתִּיחַ, "to cause to seethe, to boil and foam violently," comp. chap. xxx. 27. The "deep" [מְצוּלָה), *i. e.*, literally, the deep of the sea (=יָם) is a word which can also be applied to a great river, like the Nile; comp. Is. xix. 5; Nah. iii. 8. The Bedouins to this day call the Nile *bahr*, "sea," it being quite like a sea when it overflows its banks. **He ma-**

keth the sea (comp. ch. xiv. 11) **like a pot of ointment**, *i. e.*, as respects its bubbling and foaming. An Egyptian sea may here be assumed, standing in connection with the Nile, or perhaps one of the seas of the Jordan, if the author took a Palestinian crocodile as the object of his description. The figure of the pot of ointment can hardly allude to the strong odor of musk which the crocodile emits when playing in the water (Bochart, Del.) seeing that the poet is describing here only the *visible* effects of his tumbling and rushing in the water.

Ver. 32 [24]. **After him he maketh the path to shine,** by means of the bright white trail which he leaves behind him on the surface of the water, and which in *b* is compared to the silver bright whiteness of hoary hair (שֵׂיבָה), in the same way that the classic poets speak of a πολιὴ ἅλς (*Il.* I. 350; *Od.* IV. 405), or of a *canescere* (*incanescere*) of the waves (Catull. *Epithal. Pelei;* Manilius, *Astron.: Ut freta canescunt, sulcum ducente carina, etc.*).

Ver. 33 [25] seq.: Conclusion of the whole description, repeating the affirmation of the invincibility of the leviathan as a proud tyrant in the animal kingdom. **There is not upon the earth one who commands him**; lit. "there is not upon the dust (comp. ch. xix. 25) dominion over him," comp. Zech. ix. 10. So correctly the Targ., Pesh., and most of the moderns, while the LXX, Vulg., [E. V.], Umbreit, Delitzsch, [Lee, Noyes, Merx] translate: "on earth there is not *his like.*" By itself מָשְׁלוֹ could certainly be thus rendered; but the second member—"he who is made (הֶעָשׂוּ comp. ch. xv. 22) [Green, § 172, 5] for no-fear" (or "for, into a fearless creature," לִבְלִי־חָת)—favor rather the meaning given above.

Ver. 34 [26]. **He looks on all that is high**; *i. e.*, looks it boldly in the face, without fearing or turning back before it (comp. ch. xl. 11). **He is king over all the sons of pride,** *i. e.*, over all the huge, proudly stalking beasts of prey (comp. ch. xxviii. 8), he is therefore a tyrant in the midst of the animal kingdom, to whom the larger quadrupeds must submit, especially in consequence of the violent blows which he inflicts with his tail (Bochart, p. 767; Oken, *Allgem. Naturgesch.*, VI, 654 seq.).

6. *Job's answer and penitent confession:* chap. xlii. 1-6.

Ver. 2. **Now I know that Thou canst do all things**—now that in these two animal colossi Thou hast set before me the most convincing proofs of Thine omnipotence, and at the same time of the constant justice of Thy ways. **And that no undertaking** (no thought, or purpose, which Thou dost undertake to carry out; מְזִמָּה *sensu bono*, comp. זִמָּה ch. xvii. 11) **is forbidden to Thee** (lit. "cut off") [rendered inaccessible, impracticable]. To these thoughts, which God has the power to execute without condition or any limitation whatever, belongs, in the very first rank, the appointment of severe sufferings for men who, apparently, are innocent. This Job here recognizes as the normal result of the operations of the All-wise, All-merciful, and Righteous God in His government of the world, being just as truly the result of His operations as the terrible forms and activities of the behemoth and leviathan.

Ver. 3. "**Who is this that obscureth counsel without knowledge?**" thus, namely hast thou rightly spoken to me. The words of God at the beginning of the first discourse (ch. xxxviii. 2), are cited here verbally; and from this divine verdict, as one that cannot be assailed nor abrogated, the inference which follows is immediately drawn: **thus have I judged, without understanding, what was too wonderful for me, without knowing;** *i. e.*, the judgments which I have heretofore pronounced respecting my sufferings as unmerited and unreasonably cruel, were uttered without understanding or knowledge. To the idea, complete in itself, conveyed by הִגַּדְתִּי, "I have judged (uttered)," an object is emphatically added in the following member, so that the notion of judging passes over into that of deciding or passing judgment upon something.

Ver. 4 contains another expression, cited both from the first discourse of Jehovah (ch. xxxviii. 3), and from the introduction to the second (ch. xl. 7), here however preceded and strengthened by the short introductory clause: "Hear, I pray thee, and I will speak," and for this reason to be regarded as only a free citation, to which Job then appends the observation contained in ver. 5. This verse (4) is not therefore to be regarded as an independent entreaty on the part of Job to Jehovah, framed however in imitation of the words of Jehovah in the passages referred to (as Rosenm., Stick., Hirz., Hahn., Del. [Scott, Noyes, Barnes] think). The meaning is: "Thou hast demanded of me to make my answer to Thee, as in a judicial trial; my answer can be none other than that which now follows (vers. 5-6). [To the view that this is the language of humility on the part of Job, seeking for further instruction from God, Carey objects: "(1) That Job does not ask God any particular question on which he requires information. (2) That on the supposed view the first clause, "Hear now, and I will speak," would be the formula of an opening address, leading one to expect that that address was to be of some length, at least, whereas no such address does actually follow. (3.) That the words themselves would be too arrogant for Job to use in his present humbled state of mind. (4.) That as ver. 3 is manifestly a citation from chap. xxxviii. 2, and as the words in this present verse occur in chap. xxxviii. 3, they may reasonably be supposed to be a citation also. (5.) On the supposition of their being a citation, a more natural, and, at the same time, a more pregnant sense is obtained"].

Ver. 5. **I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear.**—"According to (לְ, as, *e. g.*, in chap. xxviii. 22; Ps. xviii. 45) the hearing of the ear," *i. e.*, on the basis of a knowledge which was mediate only, and therefore incomplete, the opposite information resting on the firm basis of immediate perception, observation, or experience; comp. Ps. xlviii. 9. **But now mine eye hath seen thee**—*i. e.*, not externally, or

corporeally, but intuitively, by means of that intellectual faith-perception which, in the visible manifestations of creation, beholds the Creator Himself; comp. the νοούμενα καθορᾶται of Rom. i. 19; also above on chap. xxxviii. 1.

Ver. 6. **Therefore do I recant**—lit. "I reject [repudiate]," that, *viz.*, which I have heretofore said; the object omitted, as in ch. vii. 16; xxxvi. 5. The LXX., Symm., and Vulg. read אֶמְאַס: "I reject, blame, accuse myself" (Luth.) [E. V.: "abhor myself"], which gives substantially the same sense with the Masoretic reading (for Böttcher's rendering of this Niphal—"I despair"—finds no conclusive support in chap. vii. 5), but is by no means of necessity to be substituted for the same. **And I repent** (am sorry, נִחַמְתִּי, Niph.) **in dust and ashes**—*i. e.*, like one in deep mourning, one who feels himself completely broken and humbled; comp. ch. ii. 8, 12. And so Job returns, as it were, to his heap of ashes, the symbol of his voluntary submission under the mighty hand of God. He perfectly resumes that patient resignation to the will of God, out of which he had allowed himself to be provoked by the accusation of the friends, in that he recognizes the divine decree of suffering as one that has been inflicted on him not unjustly, and holds his peace, until the sentence of the Most High, pronouncing His blessing upon him, again exalts the upright penitent.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The progress which this second discourse of God, taken in connection with Job's confession of penitence, marks in the inward development of the poem, is in general clear. The destruction and punishment of the proud self-exaltation of the presumptuous censurer of God's ways, which had constituted the aim and issue of the first discourse (see on ch. xl. 5), must be followed by the entire overthrow of the *presumption* in Job's heart, in consequence of which he had not deeply and earnestly enough perceived his sinfulness, had doubted whether the severe visitation which had come upon him was deserved, and had thus assailed God's justice. In addition to the complete humiliation of Job it was necessary still further to produce in him entire contrition, the voluntary confession of his guilt; and this is exactly what this second discourse aims at and accomplishes. It accomplishes this, as may be seen from the first part, which is in the form of a direct rebuke (ch. xl. 7-14), by the ironical challenge addressed to Job, to take the government of the world into his own hand, and to judge the proud transgressors on the earth (see ver. 10 seq.). This is a challenge which shows an advance beyond the series of ironical questions in the first discourse, in that it imputes to him who is addressed not merely the exercise of a high, wonderful, and all-embracing divine *knowledge*, but rather of an omnipotent *activity* resembling that of God, the ruler of the universe. God now no longer says, "knowest thou?" or "canst thou?" but "do it! seat thyself on my judicial throne!" and the stronger irony which flashes forth from such appeals must in the nature of things be accompanied by a stronger power to cause shame to him who is addressed, so that the last remnant of presumption in his heart is swept away. "By thus thinking of himself as the ruler and judge of the world, Job is obliged to think of the cutting contrast between his feebleness and the divine rule, with which he has ventured to find fault; at the same time, however, he is taught that—what he would never be able to do—God really punishes the ungodly, and must have wise purposes when He does not, as indeed He might, let loose at once the floods of His wrath" (Del.). In other words: Job, brought to the lowest depths of shame, must, by that challenge, be made sensible of two things in one, the omnipotence and the inflexible justice of the divine government of the world. He is compelled to see that there cannot be, and least of all in the administration of the Most High, a "bare omnipotence," disjoined from justice and love.

2. So far the purpose of this discourse is clear. But is the second part of it, which is characterized by disproportionate length, and in which nature, or rather, more particularly, the *animal* world, is described, in accordance with this purpose? Are we, with a number of critics (see *Introd.* § 9) to reject this part of the book as not genuine? Or, instead of resorting to this violent operation, favored as it is by nothing in the historic transmission of the text, are we, by more profoundly fathoming the meaning and aim of this wonderful description of animals, to exhibit its original organic connection with its surroundings? Obviously there is little to be gained from such ingenious, and yet at bottom superficial remarks as that of Herder: "Behemoth and Leviathan are the pillars of Hercules at the end of the book, the *Non plus ultra* of another world;" and just as little from the flat and shallow physical theology of the vulgar rationalism, which represents the poet as finding in these "prodigies of the amphibious world" (ver. 9) the hippopotamus and the crocodile, "the power, wisdom, and goodness of God" (see, *e. g.*, Wohlfarth on the passage), or from the downright allegorizing of the Church Fathers, who in the leviathan and also in behemoth found the devil, with whom also Luther is in accord, when he says: "By behemoth is meant all the large monster beasts, and by leviathan all the large monster fishes. But under these names he describes the power and might of the devil, and of his servants, the ungodly multitude in the world."* On the other side, the opinion favored by most moderns, that the hippopotamus and crocodile, like the animal pictures grouped together in the first discourse of Jehovah (Second Part, ch. xxxviii. 39 seq.), are designed to illustrate the greatness and wonderful glory of God's creative energy, and so to present impressive pictures of created existence mirroring the omnipotence of God—this opinion is far from furnishing a perfectly

* Concerning Luther's predecessors in this Satanological allegoristic interpretation (which of late H. V. Andrea has again attempted to revive up to a certain point, see Homiletic Remarks below—but which the representation of Satan in the prologue clearly shows to be inadmissible), see above on chap. xl. 19, and comp. G. M. Dursch, *Symbolik der Christlichen Religion*, Vol. II. (1859), p. 344 seq. [Wordsworth also adopts this allegoristic interpretation, and applies in detail to **Satan** the description of both behemoth and leviathan.]

satisfactory explanation of the poet's purpose in describing so earnestly and elaborately these two animals, and in this way dissipating completely the doubt which has been raised touching the genuineness of this section of the book. That which alone can help us to a correct appreciation of the poet's purpose is the truth, flowing from the view of nature presented throughout the revealed Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, that *the entire animal world is a living text-book, a mirror of morals, now warning, now encouraging and shaming us, a gallery of pictures, ethical and parenetic, collected for men by God Himself;* and that in particular the animals distinguished for ferocity and size are awe-inspiring examples for us, *symbols, as it were, or pictorial embodiments of the Divine Wrath.* Novatian, in his work on the Jewish legislation touching food (*De cibis Judaicis*), says: *In animalibus mores depinguntur humani et actus et voluntates;* and most of the Church Fathers express themselves in substantial agreement with this view in respect to the more profound ethical and symbolical significance of the animal world. So, *e. g.*, Clement of Alexandria, among whose utterances on this subject (*Pædag.* III. 11; *Strom.* II., p. 389 C; 405 D, *etc.*), that which he has said respecting the sphinx (*Strom.* V., p. 561 C) deserves to be mentioned here as being of special significance: "the human half of this creature teaches us that God is to be loved, the animal (τὸ θηρίον) that He is to be *feared.*" Comp. also Irenæus (*Adv. hær.* V. 8), Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* II. 18; IV. 24; *De Resurr. carn.* 52), Origen (*Homil.* VII. in Levit.), Gregory of Nyssa (*Opp.* T. I., p. 165, 166), Chrysostom (*Homil. in Genes.* XII.), and Jerome, who (*Comm. in Isaj.* l. VI. c. 14, p. 259, Vall.) sets forth with peculiar vividness the ethical significance of animals, especially of the poisonous and ravenous sort: *Mores igitur hominum in diversis animantibus monstrantur, sicut Pharisæi et Sadducæi propter nequitiam appellantur genimina viperarum et propter dolos Herodes vulpus dicitur, etc.** That this ethico-symbolical, or, if you please, ethico-allegorical, conception of the animal world is most deeply rooted in the Sacred Scriptures, and especially in the Old Testament, scarcely requires to be more particularly proved. We need only refer to the many passages where godless men, who have sunk beneath their proper dignity, are described as "beasts" (בְּהֵמָה), such as Psalm xlix. 13 [12], 21 [20]; lxxiii. 22; Jer. v. 8; Dan. iv. 12 seq.; comp. also Ps. xxxii. 9; 2 Kings xix. 28; Tit. i. 12, *etc.* Is it likely that our passage, which, with the most penetrating sympathy, describes two species of wild beasts, whose ferocity and strength make them dangerous, setting forth their physical constitution and mode of life, was composed without any reference to this deeper symbolical significance of the animals for man? Because it has nothing in common with that archetypal ideal significance which belongs to those royal beasts which appear in Ezekiel's description of the cherub, the lion, the eagle, and the ox. is it therefore devoid of all and every profounder meaning, and entitled simply to the claim of being a broad, detailed, poetic description of natural objects, without any religious and ethical purpose? If the passage did not itself repeatedly call attention to the deeper meaning of that which is described, we might possibly entertain in regard to it that depreciative opinion which regards it as not genuine. But after the repeated intimations which itself conveys—especially in ch. xl. 19; xli. 19; 2 [10], 3 [11], 14 [22], 17 [25]—concerning the presumptuous pride and the tyrannical ferocity of the two animals described, it is scarcely to be doubted that, according to the clearly defined and firmly maintained purpose of the poet, these are to be regarded as *symbols not merely of the power, but also of the justice of God;* or, in other words, that the divine attribute of which the poet desires to present them as the vivid living mirror and manifesting medium is omnipotence in the closest union with justice (more particularly with punitive justice, or wrath), or omnipotence in its judicial manifestations. These two pictures from the animal world are designed to hold up before Job the truth that all pride and presumption shown by God's creatures towards Him, the Creator, can avail nothing; and that there is nothing in the creation so powerful and fearful, or even so invincible to man, but that it is compelled to serve the wise and exalted purposes of God in governing the world. They are intended to teach him "how little capable of passing sentence upon the evil-doer he is, who cannot even draw a cord through the nose of the behemoth, and who, if he once attempted to attack the leviathan, would have reason to remember it so long as he lived, and would henceforth let it alone" (Delitzsch).—To go further in the direction of a symbolical and allegorical explanation of the two monsters, and to find in them emblems of the world-power which is hostile to God, but which is powerless as against Him, would not be advisable. At least the description contains no sort of intimation, pointing more definitely to such an emblematic application to any historical empires or nations; and the pre-eminently significant and instructive passage at the close of the discourse in which the leviathan is described as "king over all the proud," gives us to understand clearly enough what is the deeper meaning which the poet wishes to put in the very foreground of his description. [See further the very striking remarks on the view of the animal kingdom conveyed by these descriptions, in their "contradiction to those oriental dreams which made the animal creation an occasion of offense to the languid, oriental devotee," and their "accordance with those juster views of the economy of the animal system which modern science has lately brought itself to approve," in Isaac Taylor's *Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry*, Ch. VIII.]

* Among later advocates of the same idea, comp., *e. g.*, Peter Damiani, *Opusc.* 52: *de bono religiosi status et variarum animantium tropologiis;* Pierre Viret, *Metamorphose Chrestienne*, Genève, 1561; Joh. Bapt. Porta (†1561), *De physiologia humana;* Jac. Böhme, *Gnadenw.* VII. 3, 4; V. 20, *etc;* John Bunyan, in his Autobiography [Works, Vol. I., p. 28, Newhaven, 1831]; also G. H. v Schubert, *Geschichte der Seele*, 4th Ed., p. 732 seq.; Lotze, *Mikro kosmos.* II. p. 108 seq; also my *Theol. Naturalis*, I. p. 537 seq.; 541 seq.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

It will not be found difficult in the homiletic treatment of this discourse rightly to apprehend

and profitably to apply both the fundamental parenetic thought which it presents (as distinguished from that of the first discourse of Jehovah), and the allegorical vesture and illustrative treatment which it receives in the second longer part. The older practical expositors indeed do not furnish much help, because they wander for the most part into the extreme of unhealthy allegorical exaggerations, just as the modern scientific exegesis, in the majority of its representatives, strays into the opposite extreme of a superficial, barren, literal interpretation. A few hints deserving attention may be introduced here from the older as well as the more recent expositions of the discourse.

Ch. xl. 7 seq. Brentius: Thus doth the Lord say to Job: Is my judgment, by which I either afflict the pious, or declare all men to be liars, to be made void and of no effect by thy opinion? Does it behoove me to be unrighteous, in order that thy righteousness may be established? Thou art righteous indeed, and to this thou hast my own testimony (in ch. ii.), but thou art not therefore at liberty to calumniate God's judgments in the afflictions which He sends.—Cramer: Those who ascribe to themselves any righteousness before God proceeding from their own powers, they do nothing else than condemn God, and attempt to annul His sentence, as though He had no authority and power to judge, and to condemn them (Rom. iii. 4)!—Starke: God seeks to remind man, not once simply, but again and again, of the sins which he has committed, and to work in him thorough conviction, in order that his repentance may be sincere (Matt. xxiii. 37).—Wohlfarth: As God repeatedly challenges Job to convict Him, the author of his lot, if he can, so does the Lord in His works and word call upon us to do the same. And if we do not succumb to the power of sorrow on account of our sufferings, if on the contrary we hearken to the voice of divine truth which everywhere surrounds us, we shall be constrained to acknowledge that the sufferings of the pious are always under God's oversight, and that, so far from making the friend of virtue wholly unfortunate, it is absolutely certain that He, the Almighty and Holy One, guards innocence, and that if He will not deliver it here, He will recompense it hereafter for the pain which it has endured here below.

Ch. xl. 15 seq. Coccejus: It will be easy, if we wish to follow Scripture, to resolve into an allegory those things which are here spoken to Job, both in general and in detail (!), and from the physical object described to learn a notable lesson. For it is a remarkable feature of God's plan that He makes the most savage of men subserve the good of the Church, so that although they may not love God from the heart, nor understand the truth, they will nevertheless, notwithstanding their own wisdom and judgments be thereby condemned, embrace the pious, hear cheerfully the word of truth, take pleasure in the reputation of the faithful, ... so that now with the whole world raging against the truth of the doctrine of Christ, it is a great and blessed dispensation that many vain, proud, fierce, pleasure-loving men are so softened that they will endure the doctrine and reproofs of Christ's peaceful ministers, and wish to be esteemed among Christ's, without being such, *etc.*—V. Gerlach: That which this second discourse of God shows to Job is this, that justice and omnipotence are inseparable, and that in order to establish his righteousness, man must have as much power as God himself. . . . If any creature feels that in itself it is powerless, it thereby confesses at the same time that it is not righteous, but is in a moral, as well as a natural sense, dependent. For righteousness is nought else than that which the Almighty has established as the law after which the world is governed. In order now to make this principle clear to Job's perception, God does not stop in His discourse with that which He says to Job with a view to his humiliation and reconciliation; but in like manner as in the series of natural wonders presented in the previous discourse, the Lord exhibits His surpassing wisdom, so by these two most powerful beasts, which man is unable to subdue, He exhibits His power, in order to prove that man, who is not able to tame these animals, is still less able to carry out his will in the government of the world, and to humble beneath himself the pride of the unrighteous.

Ch. xli. 1 seq. H. Vict. Andreä: If in what is said of the leviathan we find it expressly set forth how utterly powerless in his own strength is man as compared with him, we are naturally led to regard this leviathan as a type of the evil, and of the human misery connected with it, which existing on the earth as they do in accordance with the divine decree and permission, present in the world without so mighty a power adverse to humanity, that the individual man, even when in his own person he is able, as in fact is the case, *inwardly* to release himself from their hold upon him by dint of a living faith, he is nevertheless, as regards his *external* participation in the evil which has come through sin into the world subject to the evil and the misery, and seeks in vain to become their master. At the close (ch. xli. 33 [26]), God points as with the finger to the pride of the leviathan, and characterizes him as king of all the "children of self-exaltation," whose servants they make themselves through their own pride. . . . Thus, at least in general, does that "accuser [murderer] of men from the beginning" (John viii. 44), in harmony with the antecedent scenes in heaven mentioned in the prologue, present himself to us here at the close as a highly expressive figure, nay as the right key to the interpretation of Job's own history, as well as of the entire history of humanity.

Chap. xlii. 1-6. v. Gerlach: Job, in repeating here the words of God in His first address to him, acknowledges to his own shame the truth of that which God had held up before him. God's incomprehensible wisdom and omnipotence have convinced him that the ways of His providence also are inscrutable.—Vilmar. (*Past.-theol. Blätt* XI, 70): By Elihu's discourses and God's judicial manifestation, and then by the repentance which is in this way produced within him, Job is brought back to the stand-point at first occupied by him (comp. ch. ii. 10), and the close of the book in general must be brought

back rigidly to this initial point. The bodily disease remains at first unrelieved, but the sting which by the intervention of the three friends it had inflicted on the sufferer, is plucked out of his soul. In a sense that is absolutely proper the book forms a περίοδος; after long wandering the resignation to God which marks the beginning of the book reappears in the resignation of its close. And after that the inward disease has been overcome, the outward is also healed by God.

HISTORICAL CONCLUSION.

CHAPTER XLII. 7—17.

1. Glorious vindication of Job before his friends: vers. 7-10.

7 And it was so, that after the Lord had spoken these words unto Job, the Lord said
to Eliphaz the Temanite, My wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two
friends: for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job
8 hath. Therefore take unto you now seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my
servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt offering; and my servant Job
shall pray for you: for him will I accept: lest I deal with you after your folly in
9 that ye have not spoken of me the thing which is right, like my servant Job. So
Eliphaz the Temanite and Bildad the Shuhite and Zophar the Naamathite went,
and did according as the Lord commanded them: the Lord also accepted Job.
10 And the Lord turned the captivity of Job, when he prayed for his friends: also
the Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before.

2. The restoration of his former dignity and honor: vers. 11-12.

11 Then came there unto him all his brethren and all his sisters, and all they that
had been of his acquaintance before, and did eat bread with him in his house; and
they bemoaned him and comforted him over all the evil that the Lord had brought
upon him: every man also gave him a piece of money, and every one an ear-ring
12 of gold. So the Lord blessed the latter end of Job more than his beginning.

3. The doubling of his former prosperity in respect to his earthly possessions and his offspring: vers. 12 *b*—17.

12 *b* For he had fourteen thousand sheep, and six thousand camels, and a thousand
13 yoke of oxen, and a thousand she asses. He had also seven sons and three daugh-
14 ters. And he called the name of the first, Jemima; and the name of the second,
15 Kezia; and the name of the third, Keren-happuch. And in all the land were no
women found so fair as the daughters of Job: and their father gave them an inheri-
16 tance among their brethren. After this Job lived an hundred and forty years, and
17 saw his sons, and his sons' sons, even four generations. So Job died being old and
full of days.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. The inward restoration of Job, his deliverance from the errors which had beclouded his heart and his knowledge, and his penitent submission under God's righteous and gracious will, is immediately followed by his outward restoration and redemption, This comes to pass in immediate connection with the sharp rebuke which God visits upon them because of their unreasonably harsh condemnation of Job, and also in connection with the brotherly intercession which Job offers in their behalf, thus heaping coals of fire on their head. The brilliant vindication, which the sorely understood man thus enjoys, is accompanied by the not less brilliant restoration of his external prosperity, as the result of which he is permitted even in this life, sooner therefore and more gloriously than he had dared to hope, to behold God as his Redeemer, and to taste in all its fulness His rewarding grace and mercy. As this conclusion of the whole matter carries us back, in respect to the facts, to the Introduction (chap. i. 1 seq.), so also does the external form of the introductory narrative here reappear; the lofty poetic style gives place again to simple prose, as the only medium suitable to

the simple but weighty facts, in which the hero's destiny is accomplished.

2 The vindication of Job, together with the divine rebuke of the three friends: vers. 7-10. **And it came to pass, after that Jehovah,** *etc.* אַחַר=אַחַר אֲשֶׁר, and so conjunctional, as in Lev. xiv. 43. God addresses Eliphaz in particular, as the spokesman, and leader of the three, who shaped their opinions. **For ye have not spoken of me that which is right, as my servant Job.** נְכוֹנָה signifies not that which is subjectively true, *i. e.*, honest, upright (Ewald, Hirzel, Schlottmann), but that which is objectively true, right (*directum*), comp. the ἀληθές of the LXX.). In respect to this objective truth, pertaining to facts, the friends in their speeches had either erred or kept silence, inasmuch as they had persistently refused to recognize Job's essential innocence, his freedom from sins of the graver sort, and had assiduously endeavored to brand him as a heinous sinner. Job, on the contrary, had maintained that which was objectively true, comparatively at least, and in substance, inasmuch as he had retained the consciousness of his innocence, and the sense of God's nearness in the heat of his trials. God accordingly solemnly recognizes him as "His servant" (comp. ch. i. 8; ii. 3), and fulfils literally the wish uttered by Job (ch. xvi. 21) that he would "do justice to a man before God and his friends."

Ver. 8 **And now take unto you seven bullocks and seven rams.**—The same kind and number of animals for sacrifice as in Num. xxiii. 1; comp. also the use of the number seven above in ch. i. 2; and see Introd., § 2, near the end. On אֵלִם, defectively written for אֵילִים, comp. Ewald, § 15, b.—עוֹלָה בַּעַדְכֶם, "a burnt-offering for you," *i, e.*, to atone for you; comp. ch. i. 5.—**Only to him will I have regard**—lit. "only (כִּי אִם, comp. Ewald, § 356) his person will I lift up, will I regard favorably," comp. Gen. xix. 21. Job's essential innocence, purity, and irreproachableness could not be more strongly declared and confirmed, in opposition to the petty suspicions of the friends than by thus commissioning him to be a priestly mediator and interceder in behalf of the three who had incurred the divine disfavor, and by thus directly verifying what Eliphaz had promised him in ch. xxii. 30 (comp. also Abraham's intercession for Abimelech: Gen. xx. 7, 17).—**That I visit not upon you the folly**: lit. "that I may not do (fulfil) for you folly," *i. e.* the punishment of your folly; נְבָלָה here means "reward, punishment of the folly," in like manner as חַטָּאת or עָוֹן signifies the *penalty* of sin. —**For ye have not spoken in respect to me that which is right, like my servant Job.**—Some MSS. exhibit both here and in the 7th verse, where the same words occur, the reading: "against my servant Job" (בְּעַבְדִּי instead of כְּעַבְדִּי); and so the Sept. also here: κατὰ τοῦ θεράποντός μου Ἰώβ. This change of the text is manifestly, however, an intentional correction in both cases.

Ver. 9. **Then went Eliphaz,** *etc.* The ו, which is wanting before צֹפַר, is supplied by some MSS., but without any necessity; see Ewald, § 349 *a*, 2. [Schultens on the contents of the ver.—*stupenda conversio rerum!*]

Ver. 10. **And Jehovah turned the captivity of Job.**—Thus are Job's past sufferings described, in accordance with the representation which he himself has often given of them as a state of captivity or imprisonment; comp. ch. vii. 12; xiii. 27, *etc.*; also the familiar Pauline expression: "I, a prisoner in the Lord" (Eph. iii. 1; iv. 1, *etc.*) Taken by itself, this phrase שׁוּב שְׁבוּת signifies neither here nor elsewhere, where it occurs (as in particular in the Messianic promises of many prophets) "to turn the imprisonment of any one," but only "to turn the turning, to cause an unfortunate turn of affairs to be succeeded by a fortunate one, which puts an end to the former." So Symmachus on this passage: ἐπέστρεψε τὴν ἀποστροφὴν τοῦ Ἰώβ; and so also the remaining versions outside the Targum. It might therefore be translated: "and Jehovah turned the *misery* of Job." **When he prayed for his friends.**—So correctly Delitzsch, Dillmann, *etc.*—not "because he prayed" (as commonly explained), or "in return for his praying" (Hirzel). For בְּ before הִתְפַּלְלוֹ can express only the idea of simultaneousness ("while, during"); and there is deep significance in the fact that the moment when his disease departs from him is the very moment when, as regards his friends, he completely forgives and forgets, notwithstanding they had so grievously injured him. The original text properly reads in the sing.: "for his friend" (בְּעַד רֵעֵהוּ), which sing., however, is to be understood generally, as in ch. xvi. 21; comp. ch. xii. 4.—**And Jehovah increased all that Job had twofold;** לְמִשְׁנֶה, comp. Is. lxi. 7, and the still stronger word πολλαπλασίονα (referring indeed to the eternal recompense hereafter) in Luke xviii. 30. The description which follows sets forth how this doubling of his former possessions (which of course is not to be pressed throughout with literal exactness) was carried out in detail.

3. The restoration and (partial) doubling of Job's former prosperity (vers. 11–17). Ver. 11 and ver. 12 *a* narrate first of all the restoration of his former honor, authority and dignity.—**Then came there unto him all his brethren,** *etc.*; all those persons accordingly, of whose cold, heartless withdrawal from him he had reason to complain so bitterly in his misery; comp. ch. xix. 13 seq. (from which passage also the term יְדֻעָיו, used here, is derived).—**And they gave him each a kesita, and each a ring of gold.**—to wit, a ring for the ear or the nose (נֶזֶם), which according to Ex. xxxii. 3 was a favorite ornament of both men and women; comp. Gen. xxiv. 22. The קְשִׂיטָה is a piece of gold of the patriarchal age, which, besides this passage, is mentioned only in Gen. xxxiii. 19 and Josh. xxiv. 32, signifying according to the ancient Versions a "lamb," but

according to the later, and perhaps the better founded etymology a "piece weighed out." Its value, it would seem, was four times that of the shekel (comp. Gen. xxxiii. 19 with ch. xxiii. 16). At any rate it is a gold coin representing a higher value than the shekel of a later period, and hence not very accurately translated by Luther a "beautiful groschen" [nor with sufficient precision by E. V. "a piece of money"]. F. Münter's *Prog. über d. Kesitah* (Copenhagen, 1824), in which a Cyprian coin, with a lamb engraved on it, is erroneously identified with the old Hebrew Kesitah, presents a view that is antiquated, and to be used only with caution. [Carey also favors the view that it was a weight *in the form* of a lamb, like the bull's heads of Egypt, and the lions and ducks of Nineveh. So also the Art. "Money" in Smith's Bib. Dic.]. In respect to the custom of bestowing presents when making a visit (either of congratulation or condolence), comp. Winer's *Realwörterb.* Art. "*Geschenke*" [Smith's Bib. Dic. "Gifts"].—**And Jehovah blessed the latter end of Job more than his beginning.**—אַחֲרִית—רֵאשִׁית, the earlier, the later period; comp. ch. viii. 7.

Vers. 12 *b*–17 describe the doubling of Job's former earthly possessions, to wit, in cattle (comp. ver. 12 *b* with ch. i. 3), and also the restitution made to him in children.

Ver. 13. **And there were to him seven sons and three daughters.**—In this respect accordingly there was no doubling; nevertheless according to the Old Testament view deceased children were not regarded as absolutely lost (see 2 Sam. xii. 23), so that this new blessing of children which Job now enjoys is still to be regarded as signifying more than the simple restoration of the earlier good. The pausal form שִׁבְעָנָה is not to be treated as an error of transcription for שִׁבְעָה (Hirz., Olsh.), but with Ewald, § 269, *c*, as an obsolete substantive שִׁבְעָן, with an unaccented feminine ending.

Ver. 14. **And the one they called** [or, **was called**] **Jemima,** *etc.*—The subject of וַיִּקְרָא is indefinite, "one, they." The names here mentioned accordingly are not such as were given to the daughters by the father himself, but appellations which the people of their acquaintance bestowed upon them *on account of their beauty.* Of these three names יְמִימָה seems to signify the "dove," or "pure as the dove" (possibly the "dove-eyed;" comp. Cant. i. 15; ii. 14; iv. 1), unless we follow the ancient versions, and bring the word into connection with יָמִים, "days," Arab. יַמְמָא, explaining it to mean "pure, bright as the day" (comp. *Diana* from *dies*). קְצִיעָה=*cassia*, is in any case "fine as the essence of cassia," she who was "as if woven out of the fragrance of cinnamon" (Del., with a reference to Cant. i. 3). The third was called קֶרֶן הַפּוּךְ, "paint-horn, box of ointment," on account of her graceful nature and action, which served to heighten her natural beauty; hence the charming one, who spread her charm all about her. In respect to קֶרֶן, "box, jar," comp. 1 Sam. xvi. 1, 13. On the painting of oriental women, see 2 Kings ix. 30; Jer. iv. 30; Ezek. xxiii. 40; also Rosenmüller, *Morgenland,* IV. 269 seq.; Hartmann, *Das Ideal weiblicher Schönheit,* p. 35 seq., 307 seq. [Smith's Bib. Dic. Art. "Paint"].

Ver. 15. **And their father gave to them their inheritance in the midst of their brethren.**—This act of Job's, which was strictly at variance with the regulations of the Mosaic law (see Num. xxvii. 8 seq.), but which has its parallel in certain family customs of the Arabs, rather than in practices specifically Hebrew, was intended to make it possible for the daughters to continue to live among their brothers even after their marriage; it is mentioned accordingly as a sign of the brotherly and sisterly concord which prevailed among these later children of Job as among the earlier (comp. ch. i. 4).—The masc. endings are used in לָהֶם and אֲחֵיהֶם (referring in each case to the daughters), as in ch. xxxix. 3.

Ver. 16. **And Job lived after this a hundred and forty years.**—How long he had lived *before* this does not appear from what precedes. The LXX. arbitrarily represent him as being seventy years old at the time when his sore trial befals him, as is evident from their rendering of this passage: *ἔζησεν δὲ Ἰὼβ μετὰ τὴν πληγὴν ἔτη ἑκατὸν ἑβδομήκοντα· τὰ δὲ πάντα ζῇ ἔτη διακόσια τεσσαράκοντα* (so at least the Vatican text, while the *Cod. Alex.* and various other MSS. and Ed.'s add an *ὀκτώ* to the latter number, thus placing the *πληγή* in Job's seventy-eighth year, and representing his entire age as being two hundred and forty-eight years). ["As we do not know how old he was when his affliction came upon him, we cannot precisely determine the age at which he died; but as he had previously to his affliction a family of ten children all grown up, he could not have been less than sixty or seventy years. And as in other respects God gave him twice as much as he had before, so perhaps also in this. The half, then, of one hundred and forty gives us seventy, and the two periods united make two hundred and ten, an age which unquestionably places Job in patriarchal times." Carey].—**And saw his children, and children's children, through four generations.**—Instead of וַיַּרְא the K'ri exhibits the unusual form וַיִּרְאֶה, preferred probably on account of its fuller musical tone (comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 42; Ezek. xviii. 14). As parallels in thought, comp. Gen. l. 23; Prov. xvii. 6; Ps. cxxviii. 6; Tob. ix. 11.

Ver. 17. **And Job died old and sated with life.**—The same formula is found in Genesis in recording the end of Abraham's life, and of Isaac's (Gen. xxv. 8; xxxv. 29). Delitzsch strikingly: "The style of primeval history, which we here everywhere recognize, is retained to the last words."

4. The *Alexandrian Version* presents after ver. 17 the following long addition (see the same in the original, together with the more important variations in Stier and Theile's *Polyglotten-Bibel,* III. 1, 604 seq.): "It is written however that he will rise again with those whom the Lord raises up. This man [Job] is described in [lit., interpreted out of"] the Syriac Book [Bible]

(*i. e.*, is described according to the account of the *Hebrew* Holy Scripture*) as living in the land of Ausis [Uz], on the borders of Idumea and Arabia; but his name before was Jobab. And he took an Arabian wife, and begat a son whose name was Ennon. But he himself was the son of his father Zare, one of the sons of Esau, and of his mother Bosorrha (Bozra), so that he was the fifth from Abraham. And these were the kings who reigned in Edom, over which land he also ruled; first, Balac, the son of Beor, and the name of his city was Dennaba (Dinhaba); but after Balac Jobab, who is called Job; and after him Asom (Chusham), who was governor out of the country of Thæman: and after him Adad (Hadad), the son of Barad, who destroyed Midian in the plain of Moab; and the name of his city was Gethaim. And the friends who came to him were Eliphaz, a son of Sophan, of the sons of Esau, king of the Themanites; Bildad, son of Ammon, the son of Chobar, sovereign of the Sauchæans (Shuhites), Sophar, king of the Minæans (Naamites). Theman, son of Eliphaz, ruler of Idumea. This one is described by [interpreted out of] the Syrian [*i. e.*, Hebrew] Bible, as living in the land of Ausis [Uz], on the borders of the Euphrates; but his name aforetime was Jobab; but his father was Zareth, from the rising of the sun (the East)."

Here evidently we have to do with an interpolation, compiled with a good deal of confusion and recklessness out of the statements of our book and those of Gen. xxxvi. (especially vers. 10, 15, 32-36), either by Hellenistic Jews, or possibly even by Christian hands (as Hirzel infers from the allusion to the resurrection in the introductory words). No sort of value attaches to it, and it was rejected accordingly even by Origen (*Ep. ad. African.*) and Jerome. Neither was it introduced into the Greek versions of Aquila and Symmachus, nor into that of Theodotion except in part, and so it has always been excluded from the authorized Latin version of the Bible.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

It has been justly remarked (Del. II. 392) that a New Testament writer would have closed our book in some other way than with the recital of an abundant temporal recompense, such as finally befel the great sufferer, of an earthly restoration and an indemnification in material possessions, and the prolongation of his life on earth; for it is certainly true that the New Testament regards the recompense of affliction and sore tribulations as belonging to the hereafter, and always points those who suffer for Christ and the Gospel to a future reward in heaven (comp. Matth. v. 3, 10–12; xix. 29; Mark x. 29, 30; Rev. vii. 14, *etc.* It would, however, be a one-sided inference from the conclusion of the book as it stands to regard it as ministering to an external, abstract, temporal theory of retribution. Just as decidedly to be rejected as one-sided is the theory adopted by several modern expositors (comp. *Introd.* § 4 *a*), that the purpose of the book is just the opposite, to controvert—namely, the Mosaic theory of retribution, and that the contents of the epilogue, for that reason, contradict the poem proper, and that the genuineness and authenticity of the former are accordingly to be questioned (*Introd.* § 8). That Job, after enduring to the end a trial of suffering of inexpressible severity should be rewarded with prosperity in this life, that he should not only receive a most brilliant vindication, and be again honored, but also be most abundantly indemnified, this is, first of all, a feature of the book which is characteristic of the Israelitish nationality, which is in harmony with the spirit of the Old Testament people of God (a feature which may be compared with that truly German depth of feeling and freshness of life which is impressed on the well-known bright conclusion of the Gudrun). It is in the next place a feature which harmonizes with the spirit of the Old Testament revelation itself, which is most deeply grounded in that revelation, in which the faith of believers before the coming of Christ in the unchangeable wisdom and righteousness of God's dealings, found one of its most glorious witnesses. This close of the narrative, indeed, has nothing to say of that which took place in *heaven* after Job's victorious struggle of faith; neither does it undertake to furnish any prophetic descriptions of Job's own entrance into the communion of the holy and the blessed in the life beyond. All the more fresh and true to nature, however, are the colors with which it pictures the restored earthly prosperity of the sufferer, and it visibly refrains from causing the wishes and hopes which Job had frequently uttered (especially in chaps. xvii. and xix.) for a vindication from God in the *future* life to be transcendently surpassed and eclipsed by the splendor of that which in part he enjoyed *here on earth.* Without this conclusion, the heart's need of Old Testament believers would have found no true satisfaction; the issue of the conflict of doubt, excited by the peculiarly severe and hard to be understood visitation of Job, would have remained more or less undecided; those children of God who were limited to the anticipatory and typical *fides Veteris Testamenti* would not have been able to derive from the book perfect and true consolation. Nevertheless it remains no less true that the consolation ministered by the book, according to its inmost essence, is *not* different from the consolation of the children of God under the New Testament. The Book of Job is a genuine "Cross and Comfort Book" for us who are Christians, as well as for Old Testament believers, as surely as that it teaches unconditional submission to God's holy will, and childlike resignation to His merciful Fatherly love as the only true source of religious blessedness and real peace of soul, and presents in Job the example of a sufferer, whose suffering has a twofold aim, on the one side to prove his innocence, on the other to tempt, *i. e.*, to reveal his inmost secret sinfulness, who accordingly has a twofold typical significance as sufferer, being typical of Christ, who through suffering was

* We find a help to the right explanation of the singular words *οὗτος* (sc. Ἰὼβ) *ἑρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλου* in a remark of Olympiodorus in the *Catena Patr. Græc.* in l. Job, coll. Niceta, Lond., 1637: *Συριακὴν νῦν τὴν τῶν Ἑβραίων διάλεκτον καλεῖ.* From this it appears that *οὗτος* refers not so much to the *book* of Job (Dillm.), but also to the *person* of the hero, and that *ἑρμηνεύεσθαι ἐκ* is used in the sense of "being related, or described by."

perfected as Mediator and High-Priest of the New Covenant, and typical also of Christians, whose sufferings, like those of Job, ever present the double aspect of probational and castigational visitations of God.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

In the *homiletic* treatment of the epilogue, special attention should be devoted to the thought last emphasized, to wit, the character of Job's suffering, as intended both for probation, and also for chastisement or purification. The most suitable opportunity for presenting this thought will be in connection with the rebuke of the friends, which Jehovah proceeds to administer immediately after that true and complete repentance has been wrought in Job (vers. 7-10). For it is at this point that Job's comparative innocence is definitely declared on the one hand, at the same time that it is only where Job has been humbled in sincere heartfelt penitence, that he is solemnly pronounced righteous by God,—nay more—that it is only when in fervent brotherly love he intercedes for his opponents that his bodily suffering is removed (see on verse 10), wherein it is most clearly intimated that sin is to be included as one cause of his suffering. It is to this description of Job's justification, which furnishes occasion for a concise recapitulation of the fundamental ideas of the whole dialogue, (especially of the discourses of Elihu and of God), that the practical expositor should most of all give his attention, while what is said concerning the restitution and doubling of Job's external possessions need occupy only a secondary place.

Particular Passages.

Ver. 7 seq. BRENTIUS: The three friends spoke ill, Job well; while at the same time Job argued ill, the friends well. For the friends thought wickedly, when from the affliction they decided that God was angry, and Job wicked, although they discourse excellently concerning the omnipotence and wisdom of God. Job on the other hand speaks well when he continually affirms that afflictions had befallen him not because he had deserved them, and that they were not evidences of his wickedness, and of an angry God. But he speaks ill when he impugns God's decree, and blasphemes God. Now since Job has a good cause as against the friends, although he sins in the management of his cause, while the friends are at fault touching the merits of his cause, the Lord pronounces sentence for Job against the friends; for He had previously rebuked his blasphemies.—V. GERLACH: Inasmuch as Job, although guilty of speaking foolishly, nevertheless gave utterance to his sense of the contradiction which tortured him, in that he retained the consciousness of his fellowship with God in the midst of his feeling of God's wrath, he was nearer the solution of the enigma than the friends.

Ver. 10 seq. BRENTIUS: You now see by the fact itself what is the issue of trial; for God inflicts nothing on any one in order that He may destroy him, but that He may restore much more; "Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord," *etc.* (James v. 11).—STARKE: God causes the temptation of His saints to work a good end (1 Cor. x. 13); He lays a burden on us, but He helps us again, (Ps. lxvi. 10 seq.; lxviii. 20). After the trial comes the revival; after the cry of distress the gracious hearing; after the sowing in tears the reaping in joy (Ps. cxxvi.; Tob. iii. 22) . . . . (on ver. 11): As the swallows depart before the winter, but return again with the summer, so is it with the friendship of men. When tribulation has been endured to the end, and when days of prosperity and abundance of riches return, friends immediately make their appearance (Sir. vi. 8; xii. 8 seq.).—V. GERLACH: It was necessary that Job should be purified inwardly from a mercenary spirit, from self-righteousness, and selfishness in its more refined forms. This having been accomplished, he now appears in possession of honor and riches, a conspicuous memorial of God's recompensing love, recognizing all that he receives and enjoys as from God, and honoring Him far above His gifts. His life accordingly ends, having received its full completion; there remains in it nothing more that is obscure or inexplicable; it is full of promise for all God's struggling ones under the Old Dispensation; it is a type of the Perfectly Holy One, who humbled Himself to the death of the Cross, who, although a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which He suffered, and who has therefore received a name which is above every name—that Jesus Christ may be Lord to the glory of God the Father.

AMEN.



